

## NOT VOTING—46

Bachman	Dickinson	Holt	Shipstead
Bankhead	Dieterich	Johnson	Stelwer
Black	Donahey	Logan	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Duffy	McAdoo	Townsend
Bulkeley	Fletcher	McCarran	Trammell
Bulow	George	McNary	Tydings
Burke	Gerry	Metcalf	Vandenberg
Byrd	Gibson	Norbeck	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Gore	Pittman	Wagner
Caraway	Hale	Pope	White
Copeland	Harrison	Russell	
Costigan	Hastings	Schwellenbach	

So the bill was passed.

## MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1731, being Senate bill 3531.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 3531) to amend the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes", approved May 15, 1928, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I have agreed that the bill may be temporarily laid aside in order that an opportunity may be afforded the Senate to consider the alien deportation bill. It is too late to proceed this evening and, unless there is objection, I shall now move an executive session and later a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nominations of sundry doctors to be assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar. If there be no further reports of committees, the first nomination in order on the calendar will be stated.

## POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

## RECESS

The Senate resumed legislative session.

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 3, 1936, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 2 (legislative day of Feb. 24), 1936*

## POSTMASTERS

## LOUISIANA

Clement Bourgeois, Erath.  
Claude R. Moncrief, Golden Meadow.  
Theophile P. Talbot, Napoleonville.

## MINNESOTA

John A. Peterson, Belview.  
Milton H. Hottinger, Bricelyn.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Fred M. Robertson, Matoaka.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who takest away the sin of the world, hear our prayer. To everyone with burdens, to everyone who has faltered and failed, give to them Thy gracious blessing. Bring us all back to duties with strong aptitude and clear vision. Coworking with Thee, we have reasons for new faith and hope. We pray that there may be a brotherly, happy contagion running through our associations. Father in Heaven, grant that we may be kept from isolation, misunderstanding, and from ignoring the sanctities of friendship. We thank Thee for the love Thou dost inspire, for the good Thou dost engender, and for the joy Thou dost enkindle. Let the divinity which dwells within us shape our ends, molding them to grander forms and hewing them into thoughts that wander through eternity. O allow not self-interest to stiffen and harden into that permanence from which tears never flow. Strengthen us with minds true to a single purpose, and Thine shall be the glory forever. In the name of our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3806) entitled "An act to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia", disagreed to by the House; agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KING, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. AUSTIN to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 11691) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. COOLIDGE, Mr. HALE, and Mr. TOWNSEND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to recognize April 6, 1936, as Army Day.

## THEN AND NOW—1933—1936

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a radio address that I made over the National Broadcasting Co. network Wednesday night, April 1, 1936.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address, which I delivered over the radio on April 1:

As a Representative in the Congress of the United States, I welcome the invitation to speak, over the National Broadcasting Co. coast-to-coast network, from the Nation's Capital. In the limited time allotted to us let us contrast the conditions which existed at the beginning of this administration in March 1933 with those we find today, and consider the things that have been done to bring about the improvements which we shall note.

On the 4th day of March of 1933, Herbert Hoover vacated the White House and turned it over to the man who had been designated by the people of the United States as his successor. How many of us will ever forget the condition of this country financially, economically, and, indeed, socially, on that fateful day? Our plight at that moment, after 12 years of control of the Government by those who had been displaced by the votes of the people, was such that credit had completely ceased to function and was thoroughly frozen. Every bank in the United States was closed. The business of the Nation was paralyzed. Long-suffering farmers came with good reason to fear that agriculture might never recover from the depths to which it had fallen.

Labor stood in the market place in idleness, or, in many instances, worked under conditions only a little less disheartening than idleness itself. The small home owner had lost or was about to lose his home, the result of a lifetime of savings. The youth of the land, full of ambition, was bereft of faith in the country he was taught to love and was nearly devoid of hope. At that awful moment in our history, the very security of our country and of our form of government was in doubt and many earnest citizens seriously questioned whether our Republic would survive the crisis. At this point before we consider further the history of the last 3 years let us recall that men and women turned to their new President, willingly placed in his hands the problems which confronted them and their Nation, charged him with the solemn responsibility of solving those problems, stating as they did so that they were well aware that the burden imposed upon him was an almost impossible one, begged him to take immediate action and do the best he could to bring about a solution, and expressly assured him that if he did not succeed completely they would not and could not in justice criticize him.

Let me remind you that many of the men and women who so willingly and eagerly cast their burden on the shoulders of their newly elected President are the same people who today find fault because conditions, while admittedly infinitely better than they were in March of 1933, have not yet reached a state of perfection.

Immediately upon assuming office our President, with a master stroke, which will never be forgotten, closed every bank in the United States. These institutions opened only when they were in proper condition to receive with safety the deposits of the people of the country. The next move of the administration was the passage of the Emergency Banking Act under which the banking system was reorganized and strengthened, and the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which operates to guarantee the safety of deposits in both State and Federal banks. Only a few days ago the Comptroller of Currency announced that deposits in national banks had reached an all-time peak and that the total deposits in the banks of this country had increased by more than \$6,000,000,000 during the past 3 years.

The commerce of the United States in foreign nations dropped from \$9,000,500,000 in 1929 to \$3,000,000,000 in 1932, due in part to high tariffs which cut off foreign trade and retaliatory measures resulting in loss of foreign markets for American products. Our domestic industrial production declined from seven billion in 1929 to less than half that figure in 1932, with a consequent reduction in persons employed in production to a point where nearly 14,000,000 people walked the streets and roads of the United States in a futile quest for work.

To offset the destructive effects of the high-tariff policy of preceding administrations Congress authorized reciprocal-trade treaties with foreign nations. These agreements properly construed will rebuild our foreign commerce on a sound basis. They have done away with the old logrolling tariff schedule arrangement and may be revised as experience suggests. Proceeding with its program Congress appropriated \$3,300,000,000 for public works, to be used in the construction of useful projects throughout the country both Federal and non-Federal. In every State in the Union the people are enjoying the benefits of permanent improvements which have resulted from P. W. A. activities. It may be noted in this connection that there has never been a suspicion of corruption in connection with the expenditures of this vast sum of money.

The relief problem of the country was tackled immediately by the incoming administration. Let us not forget that while the preceding administration had, until its last days, failed to recognize, as a national problem, the misery and suffering which accompanied unemployment, the new administration immediately called a conference in Washington of Governors of States, mayors of cities, and officers of counties to work out a relief solution. The President announced in a clear and unmistakable way and with the approval of the country at large that no man, or woman, or child would be permitted to starve. Plans were immediately set in motion for the administration of the relief program in conjunction with the States. Food, shelter, and clothing were furnished to all who were in need.

The Works Progress Administration was created for the purpose of giving employment to more than 3,000,000 men and women. These American citizens hated the dole system because, as Americans, they preferred work at their trades rather than charity from their Government. Our purpose has been to furnish employment on public projects and so maintain morale until recovery shall have progressed to the point where private industry affords sufficient opportunity. All of these public plans had their source in the States and were approved by the States; not one of them originated in Washington.

The agricultural problem was one of the first to which attention was directed after the inauguration. We are all familiar with the unprecedented efforts put forth to better farm prices and farm conditions generally. The people of Nebraska, whom I have the honor to represent, know of those efforts because of what they meant in dollars and cents. Between March of 1933 and January 1 of the present year, prices of farm products increased as follows: Wheat, from 31 to 91 cents per bushel; corn, from 13 to 53 cents per bushel; oats, from 10 to 24 cents per bushel; hogs, from \$3 to \$8.70 per hundredweight, and so on throughout the full list of farm products.

Since the Supreme Court decision a substitute farm-relief bill, the Soil Conservation Act, has been passed for the purpose of preserving land fertility, preventing loss through erosion. One

of the aims of the law is to return fair rewards to farmers for their work in the form of reasonable prices for their products.

The administration then created the Home Owners Loan Corporation, to save homes throughout the Nation by refinancing on long-term payments and low rates of interest. The Federal Housing Administration set up by Congress resulted in a stimulation of the building industry so that for the last 3 months of 1935 the number of building permits for residences alone increased 250 percent over the last 4 months of the preceding year of 1934, and this in spite of the fact that the agency was begun only in the summer of 1934. A gain in production of durable and heavy goods has immediately followed this increase in the building industries and trades.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was organized under President Hoover but its activities had been limited to the advance of funds to the great corporations, such as the \$80,000,000 furnished to the Dawes' bank of Chicago. However, under the present administration, billions of dollars have been loaned to farmers on their products, as well as to closed banks, agricultural credit companies, railroads, and mortgage loan companies. Funds have been made available for projects which are self-liquidating and in which the Government advance is sound and secure. Practically every phase of business, commerce, industry, and agriculture has been assisted by the Government through the agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The next advance step by this administration was the establishment of the Securities Exchange Commission for the protection of American investors in securities. This one piece of legislation, it is fairly estimated, has saved the citizens of this country hundreds of millions of dollars.

Later the Civilian Conservation Corps was established. It snatched a half million young men from idleness, from despair, and from possible moral degradation, and enabled them to carry on as upstanding citizens, capable of making economic and spiritual contributions to the country whose Government had strengthened them morally, physically, and intellectually.

It is not possible in this broadcast to review in more detail the tremendous program of welfare and recovery undertaken by the Roosevelt administration. Nothing human is perfect. This truth was never better demonstrated than in the efforts made by previous administrations during the 12 years preceding March of 1933. We do not claim perfection, but we do claim that we have exerted ourselves on behalf of the common man, the average citizen, heretofore unprotected, as well as on behalf of all business, industry, commerce, and agriculture. The administration's record in the interest of the farmer, the home owner, the worker, and the small businessman has no parallel in the history of this Nation. The recovery of all lines of business, since the dark days of 1933, likewise has no equal in our country's history in a similar period of time.

Let us consider a few instances of the recovery which has taken place since 1933. The total annual income of the American people has risen from thirty-nine billion to fifty-four billion dollars.

Farm income has increased by \$3,000,000,000. The value of securities of the New York Stock Exchange has grown from fifty-four billions to eighty-six billions. Two million homes have been saved for their owners. Commercial failures have dropped from 31,800 to 12,185, and liabilities of failed institutions have decreased nearly \$700,000,000. Industrial production was 63 percent of normal in 1932. It was 88 percent of normal in 1935. Employment was 64 percent of normal in 1932. It was 82 percent of normal in 1935. Pay rolls were 46 percent of normal in 1932 and 70 percent of normal in 1935. Registration of passenger automobiles increased from 20,000,000 in 1932 to more than 25,000,000 in 1935. Industrial production increased from thirty-one billions in 1932 to more than forty-five billions in 1935. The total of income of the 15 leading industries of the Nation in the year 1935 was 33.9 percent greater than in the year 1934.

These facts and figures are cited as high lights to illustrate the actual recovery which has been made under the Roosevelt administration. In 1932 the United States Government sold United States Government bonds on the financial market as low as 82. Today Government bonds are selling as high as 115, although the interest rate has been reduced and the public debt increased. During the war period our national debt was enlarged from about \$1,000,000,000 to \$26,000,000,000. As a result of laws passed under the Wilson administration, this debt was reduced by \$10,000,000,000 in the 10 years following the war. Under the Hoover administration our debt rose from sixteen to about twenty-one billions. During the present administration it has risen to about \$31,500,000,000, of which figure about four billions represent amply secured advances to private and public corporations which will be repaid to the Government. Within the last 3 weeks the stability and financial security of our Nation has been demonstrated in a positive and certain way. A billion and a quarter of low-interest-bearing Government securities were offered to the public and were not only all purchased but were enormously oversubscribed. As recovery continues the amount of emergency-relief expenditures diminish and Government revenues mount. Thus will our national debt be reduced as recovery marches on. In the reading room of the House of Representatives are newspapers from all the great cities of this country. Minority party leaders frequently call attention to editorials in antiadministration papers, bitterly condemning the recovery efforts of the party in power, but they carefully omit any reference to the long lists of corporate reports appearing on the financial pages of the same issue—reports which prove conclusively the upward trend of general business activity.



I promised to cite examples showing the contrast between 1933 and 1936. My references are all based on accepted statistics. We have not reached the goal we hoped to attain. Relief and unemployment are matter of grave concern, though both are definitely improved. Public expenditures, while they have been substantially reduced, necessarily continue to be large. But I ask, "Who among us would not shudder with horror at the thought of returning to the status quo of March 1933?" We are obviously proceeding along the road to a real, sound prosperity. It is not "around the corner." It is in plain sight. We are rapidly marching toward it, and we shall reach it if we proceed courageously and with humane consideration.

We have a common heritage in America of freedom and opportunity. The present administration is trying to preserve that heritage. Our program is based upon truth that a chain is no stronger than its frailest link and that when we strengthen the weak we preserve the strong. Proceeding on this principle we shall establish a sound economic and social security for all the people of our beloved country.

#### MY LEGISLATIVE RECORD

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some excerpts from old speeches and bills that I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include excerpts from speeches previously made by me and certain newspaper articles; also a list of bills introduced by me, a record of my votes in the House, and my platform, as follows:

(Refer to CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for full text of speeches.)

#### THE SOLDIERS' BONUS

March 21, 1935

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ].

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record as favoring the immediate payment of the soldiers' bonus.

#### FLOOD RELIEF

April 1, 1936

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete sympathy with any bill that will affect the small-home owner and the poor people. I suppose this bill is principally for the assistance of the small-home owner and the wage earners who cannot borrow great sums of money from banks. That must have been the thought in the mind of the members of the committee. A liberal policy should be pursued in reference to this matter, but at the same time we must recognize the responsibility of the R. F. C.

The loans provided for in this bill are for the owners of small homes or small business establishments. I hope the Members will liberalize the requirements, because even the business people in Pittsburgh now have no money and no way of borrowing any money, because their resources have been washed away by the flood. Unless the restrictions are removed and the terms made very liberal, this bill will be a mere gesture and will do no good whatever.

#### OLD-AGE PENSION

April 16, 1935

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ].

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, I believe today is an epochal day in the history of humane legislation. No person or party could be responsible for this legislation except those who are progressive-minded. Ten years ago anyone who proposed legislation for an old-age pension would have been considered a radical, but at the present time conditions have changed.

Now, I would be very sorry if what the gentleman from California [Mr. McGROARTY] said should come to pass. He maintained—and I think he is correct—that those States that cannot raise the money to pension their aged will not obtain an old-age pension from the Federal Government. I want to say that the State of Pennsylvania, one of the richest States in the Nation, is at the present time bankrupt. It can scarcely pay the salaries of their own employees. I hope we are not going through an empty gesture in this legislation, but that the old people will get their pensions, which they deserve. [Applause.]

#### THE RIGHT TO LIVE

March 28, 1935

The SPEAKER. Under the special rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, at this time I rise to speak on taxation. At the present time, it seems to me, we are asking for billions of dollars and we are requesting people in business to pay taxes, not knowing how they are getting along. Just as you cannot hold the reins of a horse and tell him to "get up", just as you cannot put both feet on the brakes of an automobile and turn on the gas, likewise you cannot expect business to revive and go on while taxing it to the full extent. We wonder why business does not revive. It cannot revive if everything that business has is taxed.

#### ANTILYNCHING

June 14, 1935

Mr. MORITZ. Friends, I deem it a rare privilege to address you on a practice that has gone further toward destroying our civilization, returning to an age of persecution and barbarism, and destroying the finest principles of Americanism than any plague that had ever infested this country.

I refer to that despicable, cowardly, criminal form of lawlessness that should be ranked as public enemy no. 1 of law and order, namely, lynching.

We shudder as we review the dark, dim days of Salem witchcraft when superstition condemned many innocent victims to horrible death, to the days of the guillotine when human beings were beheaded to satisfy the whim of some monarch. Yet in this year of our Lord, 1935, we tolerate—and in some instances uphold—the mob that steals in under a blanket of darkness, defies the very law created for our protection, and condemns to horrible death some poor soul without so much as a hearing.

#### CIRCULATION OF MONEY

January 15, 1936

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, \* \* \* I would like to call your attention to the years it took to get the Patman soldiers' bonus bill in the present status. The vote yesterday was 218 to 100 to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means on the Patman bonus bill. What would have been the result 7 years ago?

Is there anybody who would contend that the money put in circulation at present by the \$5,000,000,000 appropriated by Congress is not responsible for the betterment of the present conditions? Is there anyone who would contend that the \$5,000,000 put out by General Motors as a Christmas gift was not responsible for the big Christmas boom in Detroit, Flint, and Lansing, Mich.? Would anybody contend that when the soldiers are paid their bonus that prosperity will not be given another boost?

#### CONGRESSMAN MORITZ'S PLEA FOR THE COAL MINER

August 16, 1935

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, \* \* \* I remember years ago, in 1902, it took Theodore Roosevelt's intervention to pacify the then intense strike. I remember not so many years ago it was taken as a matter of course that the poor miner be cheated openly as to the credit he received for the amount of work he produced. In other words, when the miner filled a coal car and it weighed so many pounds, the coal operators just arbitrarily lessened the weight. Now the miners have an impartial weighmaster on the tippie who gives him the correct weight of the amount of work that he does. I remember when a miner filled the car and if it did not have a "hump" on it, which means the surplus coal, which was above the amount to fill the car, the operator sent the car back to the mine and told the miner to put a "hump" on it, for which the miner received no pay.

At this time we are horrified to be aware of this downright heartless cheating, but it took many years of strenuous effort and even bloodshed to get these ordinary reforms. Now we are confronted with a bill that gives the least of these forgotten men another "ray of sunshine."

#### BLACK-LETTER DAY, MAY 18, 1920

January 29, 1936

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak on the subject of money. May 18, 1920, to my mind, ought to be put down as a big black-letter day, because it was on that date that the Federal Reserve System contracted the currency, and from that date the depression started.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the time is fast approaching when great numbers of our citizens are commencing to ask embarrassing questions of Members of this Congress.

Finally, the question I am never able to answer any constituents is this, Why does Congress not take over the whole Federal Reserve System, lock, stock, and barrel, paying its private owners in full what they paid for their stock with 6 percent from its date of purchase, less any dividends that may have been paid, and with that System as an agency of Congress, build a central bank, a monetary authority, a fiscal agency of the United States that will keep the supply of credit and currency adequate and safe; that will control inflation and deflation; that will raise price levels and destroy the greatest enemy of the Nation—the Federal Reserve System, with its private control of money? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### MR. MORITZ OPPOSES THE TOLLS

August 5, 1935

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORITZ: Page 2, line 7, strike out all of lines 7 to 23, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 2. No toll or other charge shall be made for the use of the said bridges or any of them or the approaches to them or any of them, and no toll or charge shall be made for the use of such other public works or improvements as may be associated with said bridges and approaches."

#### REGULATION OF PUBLIC-UTILITY HOLDING COMPANIES

July 1, 1935

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, \* \* \*

To be sure, thousands of innocent investors—widows, orphans, churches, and hospitals—have lost millions of dollars to the

unprincipled promoters of these holding companies; but there is no way in which that already lost can be regained, and all we can do is to enact such laws as will make it impossible for such a Nation-wide catastrophe to happen again.

The holding companies tell in their circulars and advertising about the wonderful assistance they have rendered to operating companies in the way of financing expansions and interconnections and in supplying management advice. Undoubtedly much advantage has been afforded in these directions, but at what a price. But there is nothing in this bill to preclude the continuance of such assistance.

#### WAGNER LABOR ACT

June 19, 1935

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for so graciously giving me this opportunity to take my stand and place myself on record for organized labor.

The fundamental rights of man, as so well stated in that immortal document, the Declaration of Independence, are the rights to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness. It is to be noted that the right to live, being first mentioned, is regarded as paramount. Yet under present conditions in the United States millions of people are denied the right to live except upon the charity of government.

#### CHAIN STORES BEAT OUR PUBLIC

May 16, 1935

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, \* \* \* I will not argue that the chain store cheats you at every turn by weights; that few people can long hold down a job at a chain unless he can "produce." I shall not stress the fact that a Government investigation shows short weights of 53 percent of the stores, poorer quality of merchandise, lower wages paid, or the fact that the chain sells the 8-ounce-size container marked "6 ounces" in fine print, while the independent sells the 8-ounce container marked plainly "8 ounces" of the same brand and quality and sells at 1 cent above the chains.

I am interested in the fact that chains can and do buy for less and sell for larger profits than the independent. I am interested in getting the independents the same buying power as the chains and let free competition be the peoples' safety valve to lower the price.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THEODORE L. MORITZ, REPRESENTING THE THIRTY-SECOND DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA (PITTSBURGH), FEBRUARY 6, 1935—HEARINGS ON THE LUNDEEN BILL

Mr. MORITZ. I would not go that far; I am for the Government staying out of private enterprise, but I do wish that the public-service commission would give the people of Pittsburgh some real relief. We have 8½ cents carfare, 25 cents bus fare. A taxicab, to go a mile, costs you 65 cents. There are 62 subsidiary companies owning our Pittsburgh Railways Co., each one of them having to get a profit before the car passenger is thought of. Just think of that. The city of Pittsburgh is just in a nest of extortionists.

#### MORITZ FIGHTS SHERIFFS' SALES

THEODORE L. MORITZ is awaiting a reply from President Roosevelt to a telegram sent yesterday urging a moratorium on sheriffs' sales.

MORITZ, who is Mayor McNair's secretary, and Congressman-elect from the Thirty-second District, was urged to act by groups of citizens who declared they were in danger of losing their homes.

He sent this telegram to the President:

"DEAR SIR: Citizens are in distress. Please call immediate moratorium on sheriff's sales."

#### BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED BY HON. THEODORE L. MORITZ

H. R. 6461. A bill to increase the salaries of chief clerks and clerks, employees of the railroad companies.

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to provide for relief of the floods in Allegheny County, Pa.

H. R. 7984. A bill to regulate traffic and trade, protect small business houses and industry, promote orderly marketing, encourage individual initiative, decentralize business, and give the consumers the benefit of free competition denied them by chain ownership and operation, holding companies, and interlocking directorates.

H. Res. 397. Resolution providing for a committee of five Members of the House to investigate the excessive taxes now being paid the Government on liquors.

H. R. 6765. A bill to relieve the present distress of home owners and to prevent foreclosures and to declare a temporary moratorium by providing a loan of \$300 to a mortgagor, which sum must be paid to the mortgagee for interest due or which may be due in the future.

H. R. 7732. A bill to reduce the rent of houses and apartments for Government employees in the District of Columbia, to encourage the investment of idle capital, to put laboring men to work, to take men off of relief rolls and put them on pay rolls, and to reduce the hazard of disease.

H. R. 8808. A bill to require that the name of the writer of every editorial article be appended to each copy thereof deposited in the mails or shipped in interstate or foreign commerce.

H. R. 4353. A bill to provide each Congressman with \$1,000,000 to be spent in his congressional district to build homes which will not rent for more than \$20 per month.

H. J. Res. 417. Joint resolution directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

H. R. 6026. A bill to promote the general welfare of the citizens of the United States by the exercise of the police powers of the Government through the imposition of an excise charge upon the privilege of the use and enjoyment of large landholdings, based upon their unimproved value, and a special excise charge with respect to the carrying on or doing business by corporations, joint-stock companies, or associations.

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of rehabilitation in the flood areas to be admitted without payment of tariff.

#### VOTED FOR

1. \$4,800,000,000 relief fund.
2. To extend Reconstruction Finance Corporation 2 years.
3. Soldier bonus bill.
4. Old-age pensions.
5. Wagner's Labor Act.
6. Guffey coal bill.
7. Control of public-utility holding companies.
8. Additional home-mortgage relief.
9. To prevent profiteering in time of war.
10. Railroad Retirement Pension Act.
11. Tennessee Valley Authority.
12. Moritz amendment to prohibit toll charges on bridges in Allegheny County.
13. Townsend old-age pension.
14. Vocational educational training.

#### VOTED AGAINST

1. "Gag rule."
2. Retiring Supreme Court judges with pension.
3. Merchant Marine Act.
4. Tolls on Allegheny River bridges.
5. To increase the number of Federal judges.
6. Increase the pay of retiring Army officers.

#### MY PLATFORM

1. I advocate the upholding of the Constitution of the United States, particularly section 8, article I, namely, "Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." This power should not be delegated to private interests.
2. I advocate an adequate old-age and widows' pension. As a humanitarian I believe that a family should not be separated in the twilight of life and cast into various almshouses.
3. I endorse the 16 points of the National Union for Social Justice.

#### THE LYNCHING RECORD

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Birmingham News of March 22, 1936.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Birmingham News of March 22, 1936:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of Mar. 22, 1936]

#### A SIGNIFICANT STUDY OF THE LYNCHING RECORD

The Commission on Interracial Cooperation has just published a report summarizing the results of a careful study of all lynchings in the United States in the last 5 years. The facts cited are all significant, and in some instances startling.

The most astounding fact brought out by this study is that, of the 84 persons lynched in the 5-year period, nearly half were either unaccused of crime or else were charged only with minor offenses. To be exact, in 41 percent of the cases the victims either were not only innocent of any crime, but were not even accused of any, or else were charged with offenses of a minor nature. To that record of cruel injustice is added the fact that of the other 59 percent of mob victims in the last 5 years, many were found, on investigation, to have been innocent of the crimes with which they were charged.

Highly significant also is the fact that only one-fourth of the victims were accused of actual or attempted assaults upon women. This may surprise many persons, since it is generally thought that this is the chief cause of lynchings. It does not surprise those who have followed the lynching record closely, and who know that this offense, while it accounts for only a fourth of the lynchings, is used more than anything else to keep alive the mob spirit. A further fact brought out in the report is that in a number of these cases the commission's investigators could find no convincing evidence of guilt.

With all else that is to be said against lynching—against its barbarity, against the violence it does to our institutions of law and orderly justice—surely such facts as these should serve to make all people of one mind in condemning the practice. At least everyone can agree that, when nearly half the victims of mobs are either unaccused or charged with only minor offense, and many of the rest are innocent of the crimes of which they are accused, lynching is certainly a very inefficient instrument.

#### ARMY DAY

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30.



The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30.

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, what is the object of the resolution?

Mr. McSWAIN. This is the nineteenth anniversary of the declaration of war against Germany. This does not have the force of law; it is only a concurrent resolution requesting the President to order the military units throughout the United States to assist civic bodies in appropriate celebrations to such extent as he may deem advisable.

Mr. SNELL. It does not mean a holiday?

Mr. McSWAIN. Oh, no; and it does not cost anything, either.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 30

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Monday, April 6, 1936, be recognized by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America as Army Day, and that the President of the United States be requested, as Commander in Chief, to order military units throughout the United States to assist civic bodies in appropriate celebration to such extent as he may deem advisable; to issue a proclamation declaring April 6, 1936, as Army Day, and in such proclamation to invite the Governors of the various States to issue Army Day proclamations.*

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for indefinite leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. CARY, on account of serious illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMPACTS AND AGREEMENTS AMONG STATES

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution for printing under the rule:

House Resolution 476 (Rept. No. 2344)

*Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 12037, a bill relating to compacts and agreements among States in which tobacco is produced providing for the control of production of, or commerce in, tobacco in such States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.*

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12098) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, may I ask the lady from California as to the division of time? My feeling is that we had better run along in general debate through the day, the time to be equally divided between the lady from California and myself.

Mrs. KAHN. That will be agreeable to us.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be continued today, the time to be equally divided between the lady from California and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HARLAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 hour.

I think it proper before entering into any discussion of this bill which I have the honor to present to the House, that I pause to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Judge WILLIAM B. OLIVER, of Alabama, who has so ably and zealously guided the legislative destinies of this bill since the Seventy-second Congress. Fortified as he is with a brilliant mind and having a conscientious regard for the performance of his duty, and bringing to his position as chairman years of experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee, it is with deep regret that due to his extended illness the committee has not been favored with his presence and wise counsel in its hearings, or in its deliberations attendant upon the presentation of the bill to the House. Conservation of one's health is a consideration second to none, and we are indeed happy in the knowledge that Judge OLIVER, in giving the matter of protecting his health its proper due at the insistence of every member of the committee, is showing a continuing improvement in his condition. I shall hence endeavor, to the best of my ability, to assume the responsibility which heretofore he so ably performed, of piloting this measure through its legislative paths.

I might add that I, too, want to express my appreciation to the members of the subcommittee who have so ably assisted me in the preparation of this bill. For some 6 weeks we sat daily conducting the hearings incident to the bill covering these four departments. The committee consisted of the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. CARY; the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. TARVER; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. McANDREWS; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. RABAUT; and my Republican colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. BACON, and the gentlewoman from California, Mrs. KAHN. It has been a pleasure to me to have the able assistance of these colleagues in the conduct of the hearings and the preparation of this bill.

I cannot, however, pass this compliment along without also saying a word in behalf of our able and affable clerk, Mr. Jack K. McFall. [Applause.] He has been our right bower and on every occasion has been on the job and served us in a manner that has been absolutely essential in the conduct of our work.

In order not to unnecessarily burden the House with an extended discussion of the one hundred and seventy-odd separate appropriating items in the bill, many of which could be made the subject of a separate address, I shall endeavor to confine myself to the major changes that the committee has made in comparison with last year's appropriations, touching, in the course thereof, on such collateral matters of policy or factual information, that in my opinion the membership of the House will be interested in having brought to their attention. The report accompanying the bill is quite complete in its detail, so, should I fail to cover any subject that individual Members might be interested in, I commend to their perusal the reading of the report on the bill which will, in all likelihood, contain reference to the subject desired together with an explanation of the committee's action on the matter of the appropriations connected therewith.

As an incidental observation, I may say that we have been engaged continuously since February 3 in conducting hearings with the different department heads, in arriving at the amounts we have recommended for the various activities, and in preparing the bill and the report for the consideration of Congress. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Labor each appeared before us and presented his arguments in behalf of the sums requested, which assisted the committee materially in determining the need of each department for funds to carry on its work. Our task has been difficult, and if the recommendations of the committee are accepted by you and the future should prove that some errors of judgment have been made, we shall beg your indulgence and make such further recommendations to repair our mistakes as the circumstances of the case may warrant. We have not taken unto ourselves the doctrine of infallibility in the fulfillment of our committee duties, but have performed our task to the best of our ability.



The bill H. R. 12098 as it is before you carries appropriations for the four Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor. In the fiscal year 1936, that is, the present fiscal year, appropriations totaling \$106,767,326 were made. For the next fiscal year, 1937, the Budget estimates carry a total of \$122,651,577. Your committee is recommending an appropriation of \$114,467,400, which is an increase of \$7,700,074 over the total for 1936, but is less by \$8,184,177 than the estimates submitted by the President through the Budget.

It might be well to give more than passing consideration to this increase of \$7,700,074 over the 1936 appropriations. Without making any allowance for the general increases in the Department of Justice items due to an upward trend in crime, the entire increase is offset by the increased appropriations for construction, which are capital expenditures, plus the amounts required for carrying out new laws passed by Congress during the past session. In fact, if the appropriations for these two purposes are deducted from the appropriations for 1936, the amount carried in the bill for the next year would be approximately \$1,000,000 less than appropriations for the current year. I shall ask unanimous consent at this point to insert as a part of my remarks a table of eight lines which will serve to illustrate this point by showing the different items and amounts involved in this calculation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

*Increase by principal items over appropriation for 1936*

Construction items:	
Channel rectification and flood control on Rio Grande (Mexican Boundary Commission)....	\$2,800,000
Construction of penal institutions, jails, etc. (Bureau of Prisons).....	2,850,000
Appropriations necessitated by new laws passed at last session of Congress:	
Grants to States and administration of Social Security Act (Children's Bureau).....	2,927,000
Administration of Davis-Bacon prevailing wage law (Secretary's Office, Department of Labor)...	39,000
Bituminous Coal Labor Board established by Guffey-Snyder Act (Department of Labor)....	81,000
Total increases due to new laws and construction items.....	8,697,000
Less: Total increase for all items in the bill over 1936..	-7,900,074
Excess of increases for new laws and construction over total net increase in appropriations for 1937 as compared with 1936.....	796,926

Mr. McMILLAN. The reduction of \$8,184,177 which the committee is recommending be made in the Budget estimates represents a decrease of approximately 7 percent.

One of the matters of most general concern to the committee is the ever-increasing cost of communication service in the various agencies covered in this bill. It appears that one of the principal causes contributing to this increased cost is the all too frequent use of the long-distance telephone for transacting Government business. In some cases, the use of this form of communication is undoubtedly necessary and justified and it would not be the disposition of any fair-minded person to deny the use of the telephone in emergent cases. On the contrary, evidence has been presented to the committee establishing that in many instances the long-distance telephone has been used purely as a matter of convenience when, as far as the expeditious handling of the business under consideration is concerned, the information could just as well have been conveyed either by the use of air mail or by telegraph, with a corresponding substantial reduction in cost. The committee has communicated to all heads of departments its views on this subject, and I may say that next year when we again take up the question of supply funds with the various administrative officials, we shall take especial note of the progress which has been made in reducing the cost of the communications services.

Another subject of some moment that I, in company with the committee, desire to call to your attention is the administrative promotions that are being made in some of the departments supplied with funds in this bill. In some de-

partments what approaches wholesale promotions have been made with funds accruing from lapses in the salary appropriation due to deaths, resignations, transfers, and so forth, of employees, while in some instances funds allowed for additional employees upon a showing of need have been diverted from the purpose for which they were requested and applied instead of giving salary promotions to employees already on the pay roll. The use of appropriated funds to make promotions by this latter-named method in my opinion amounts to nothing short of a breach of faith with the committee, and as far as I am concerned when evidence of this method of operation is presented to any committee of which I am a member, I shall make my views known in no uncertain manner, and use what persuasive powers I may have to effect proper remedy. With respect to the use of money saved by lapses to make these promotions, it is realized that a somewhat different picture is presented and that administrative officials in authorizing salary increases out of funds accumulated in this manner are acting within their entire rights under the law. To the knowledge of the committee, in at least one department of the Government no administrative promotions have been made since 1932, while in other departments increases running into the hundreds in number and into thousands of dollars additional cost have been made during the present fiscal year. It would seem, therefore, that in order to assure some uniformity on these promotions throughout the different branches of the Government, consideration should be given to this subject by the budgetary authorities. To permit the present conditions of unbridled administrative discretion in the matter of promotions to continue, is to perpetuate a most unhealthy condition and provoke dissatisfaction among employees of other departments.

Before discussing the items under the various Department headings, I desire to call attention to the Public Works appropriations that have been inserted in the bill. The distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. BUCHANAN, has seen fit to have the individual items in the Public Works chapter of the Budget for 1937 considered by the subcommittee, under whose jurisdiction the department charged with the expenditure of the appropriations requested would properly fall. The effect of this procedure was to charge this committee with the responsibility of considering requests for appropriations for this purpose totaling \$8,600,000. This involved estimates amounting to \$3,800,000 for rectification of the channel, the continuation of a program of flood control, and the construction of a dam—all on, or in connection with, the Rio Grande in Texas. The work is to be performed under the directorship of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico. The other work, involving an expenditure of \$4,900,000, is a program of constructing additions to some few penal institutions, dwelling houses for employees of the prison service, development work on McNeil Island, Wash., and to provide for the erection of three new Federal jails, all to be performed under the supervision of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

We have given extended consideration to these requests for funds to make these capital expenditures outlined in the preceding paragraph, resulting in a committee recommendation that the House concur in a total appropriation of \$5,350,000 for this construction. This amount, if approved, will effect a reduction of \$2,950,000 in the Budget estimates.

In explanation of this substantial decrease, I may say that \$1,000,000 of it is represented by the elimination of an item for the construction of a diversion dam on the Rio Grande. It appears that the total authorization that Congress has made for the expense of erecting this dam is \$1,000,000. The committee has been informed, however, by Mr. L. W. Lawson, the American Commissioner of the Mexican Boundary Commission, that the dam cannot be completed within the limits of the authorization and that to bring about such completion an appropriation of \$400,000 additional would be required. I may say here that the policy of our committee will be to deny all appropriations for any projected public works if the evidence indicates



that the entire construction cannot be completed within the limits of the amount authorized to be appropriated by Congress. To do otherwise would be to place at the doorstep of the legislative committee having jurisdiction the practical necessity for making the additional authorization required to complete the project in question in order to prevent absolute wastage of the appropriations already made. Such a procedure could never be conducive to economical government.

We are asking the House to concur in the appropriations requested for the flood-control and channel-rectification work on the Rio Grande. The total contained in the bill for the continuation of these two projects alone totals \$2,800,000—\$1,600,000 for the former and \$1,200,000 for the latter. Allotments have been made from P. W. A. funds in amounts aggregating more than \$7,000,000 to carry on this flood-control and channel-rectification work in cooperation with the Mexican Government, and the funds that are now carried will continue the work. There will be required, at a future date, about \$4,400,000 in additional appropriations to complete both projects.

I will now address myself to the major items of interest bearing on the appropriations for each of the four departments covered in the bill.

#### STATE DEPARTMENT

The bill, as we have presented it to the House, carries appropriations totaling \$17,654,000. While this represents an increase of \$1,542,466 over the appropriations for the present fiscal year, it is less than the Budget estimates by \$1,474,250. It should be noted that the increase over the 1936 appropriations is more than offset by the \$2,600,000 for this construction work on the Rio Grande in Texas, to which I have just made reference. In fact, but for these construction projects, the total would be less than the appropriations for the current year by more than \$1,000,000.

One of the items of most general interest to the House, as far as the present activities of the State Department are concerned, is the reciprocal-trade-agreement program. In the course of the hearings considerable information was adduced bearing on the status of the program, the countries with which treaties have been consummated, those nations with whom we are negotiating, and other facts pertinent to the general subject. Reference to the index of the State Department hearings will give page references to the different places throughout the course of the hearings where the subject was discussed. This most difficult and exacting task is being consummated under the able stewardship of Mr. H. P. Grady, Chief of the Division of Trade Agreements.

Passport Division: One of the best indications of returning prosperity is the number of passports that are issued by the Passport Division of the State Department for people traveling abroad. When people have money to spend they frequently travel; when they travel they must have passports. The Passport Division issued some 118,000 passports last calendar year as compared with about 112,000 in the calendar year 1934. This division of the Department, so efficiently directed by Mrs. Ruth B. Shipley, annually turns into the Treasury from passport fees many hundreds of thousands of dollars in excess of the modest cost of maintaining the unit in the Department and the five offices in the field.

Foreign Service Personnel Board: It was indeed pleasing to the committee to learn that through the splendid accomplishments of the Foreign Service Personnel Board there has been realized a definite improvement in the morale of our Foreign Service personnel. Without fear or favor, this Board, composed of certain officials of the State Department, has been engaged in effecting, if I may use the vernacular, a "weeding out" of those Foreign Service officers whose records have been such as to make their continuance as representatives of this Government undesirable. Strict standards of health and efficiency have been prescribed, and those not measuring up to these standards have been placed on the retired roll. The immediate effect of the retirement of some 60 Foreign Service officers by this method is to provide

vacancies that can be filled by new blood and to hold out to the new men entering the Service the possibilities of advancement in grade and salary if they conscientiously perform their duties and measure up to the requirements of conduct, health, and ability.

For the past 4 years, due to the necessities for economy, it has not been possible for the State Department to bring any of its Foreign Service officers back to this country on leaves of absence. In many far-away countries of the world officers are stationed who have not returned to their homeland for 6 years. The value of having these men brought back to the United States at reasonably spaced intervals to reacquaint them with conditions in the country for which they are devoting their lives as a career can certainly not be questioned. Up to a certain point, postponement of the expenditure of funds for leaves of absence of these officers is a legitimate field for the exercise of economy. However, to carry such a program too far serves but to make a fault of a virtue and has as its effect the impairment of the morale and a lowering of the productive value of the work of the men thus affected by such a policy. It is in the realization of this truth that the committee has recommended an increase of \$30,000 over the Budget estimates in order that the Department may embark upon a program of bringing back to the United States Foreign Service officers located in unhealthy, distant posts who have not had a home leave of absence for many years. If allowed by Congress, \$100,000 will be made available for this purpose during the next fiscal year.

It is the desire of this committee to lend every assistance in seeing that the efficiency standard of the United States Foreign Service is second to none in the world. The value of the State Department as a whole is no greater than the collective value of the services rendered by its Foreign Service officers in reporting on conditions abroad, which reports must form the factual basis for the determination of our foreign policy. In the past, after the prospective Foreign Service officer successfully hurdled the difficult entrance examination, he was put on his own, so to speak, and no Government facilities were provided to further train him in methods of enhancing his reporting ability and improving his general fund of specialized knowledge on matters pertinent to the successful accomplishment of governmental foreign affairs and diplomacy. As a modest beginning, therefore, the committee is asking you to approve an expenditure of \$10,000 to train some of these Foreign Service officers in economics, finance, and commerce in order that their value to their country as a foreign representative may be immeasurably enhanced. I might say, parenthetically, that Army and Navy officers have been favored for many years with specialized training to enhance the character of the service they render.

Today we are spending over \$1,000,000 per year in meeting our share of the expenses of maintaining a membership in various international organizations. To this total must be added upward of \$400,000 that is spent annually to pay the expenses of maintaining certain permanent international commissions—boundary commissions, waterway commissions, claims commissions, fisheries commissions, and so forth. These expenditures are necessitated almost entirely as a direct result of Congress having authorized our membership in the various organizations, or as a result of obligations growing out of a treaty with some foreign government or governments. I do not deprecate the value to us as a nation of the amount of money that we spend in maintaining our membership in many of these commissions and conferences, but I do think it only fair to observe that we are paying out about \$1,500,000 annually in cooperative endeavor with other nations. The Appropriations Committee has little, if any, choice in the matter if we are to obey the mandate of Congress and of treaties requiring that appropriations be made to make efficacious our membership in these organizations.

There is one matter, however, that I feel I should bring to the particular attention of the Members of the House before I take up the Department of Justice appropriations, and that is the subject of our membership in the International



Labor Organization. It is costing us nearly \$400,000 per year to maintain our membership in this body. It has been provided by statute that the United States shall become an adhering member. I consider it but a proper construction of our duties as an Appropriations Committee that so long as the Congress has voiced itself as being in favor of associating ourselves as a nation with the other adhering countries in endeavoring to work out recommendations and conventions for the betterment of labor throughout the world, it remains for us to approve appropriations in the amounts required to fulfill the obligations of our membership. I know that some members of the Appropriations Committee, and I may say myself included, do have grave misgivings as to whether we, to put it bluntly, are "getting our money's worth." I do not want to use this occasion to enter into any extended discussion of the work that the Labor Organization is doing and what definite value we, as a Nation, are securing from it, but I do feel that the time is propitious for reconsideration of the matter in the light of the expense involved and the results attained.

I may say, in passing, that a new item appears in the bill under the State Department heading that will provide for an arbitration of the long-standing controversy as to the amount of damage to certain foliage and vegetation in the State of Washington resulting from the emission of sulphur fumes generated in a smelter located in British Columbia. The sum of \$50,000 has been provided for the arbitration and it is to be hoped that all questions connected with this international difference with Canada will be equitably disposed of.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For the Department of Justice the committee is recommending a total appropriation of \$41,061,300. This compares with an appropriation this year of \$36,310,992 and Budget estimates of \$43,795,250. It will be seen that, while the committee has allowed in round numbers \$4,750,000 more than the comparable appropriations for this year, it is still less than the Budget estimates by more than \$2,700,000. Here again, as in the State Department, the increase over the appropriations for 1936 is partially offset by construction items aggregating \$2,850,000. Deducting this total of \$2,850,000 from the net increase of \$4,750,000, we arrive at the figure of \$1,900,000, which represents the increase over the appropriations for this year, and which, it may fairly be said, is made absolutely necessary as a direct result of the constantly increasing volume of criminal, civil, and other business performed by the Department of Justice. As an example of how the activities of the Department are growing, I might briefly cite a few statistics. During the fiscal year 1934 there were commenced in United States courts 23,032 criminal cases, while during the fiscal year 1935, 35,365 cases were instituted, an increase of 12,333 cases, or about 33 percent. At the end of the past fiscal year there were over 26,000 cases, both civil and criminal, pending in the courts, which, if no additional cases were filed, would take over 6 months to dispose of. Tax division cases have increased 7 percent; claims division cases 8 percent. The administrative division has likewise been taxed to keep up with its share of the increased work volume. Outgoing mail increased 136 percent over the previous year. The agencies of the Government devoting themselves to apprehending those violating Federal criminal statutes by their active campaign to apprehend the criminal have contributed in a large measure to this rising volume of work. The facilities of the Bureau of Prisons are being severely taxed to care for the constantly increasing prison population. In the light of these facts, it follows, as the day the night, that additional funds must be provided to meet these changing conditions. We have made reductions where it was felt that economies might be effected without seriously impairing any vital function of the law-enforcement machine. In only four items have we increased the Budget estimates, and in each of these instances save one—and the exception amounted to an increase of only \$7,665—there is every reason to believe that for every additional dollar that is provided there will be a corresponding savings to the Government and the people of many times over the amount expended.

Federal Bureau of Investigation: The principal increase of the four that I have just mentioned is to be found in the item for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. At the invitation of the Attorney General and the Director of the Bureau, the subcommittee visited the Bureau and spent several hours witnessing the operations of an extremely efficiently administered unit. For the sake of brevity, I will not be able to discuss at length the functions this Bureau is called upon to perform, but I do desire to leave a few thoughts with the House with respect to just what this Bureau is doing.

About 12 years ago, a small fingerprint file that was housed in the Leavenworth Penitentiary was transferred to Washington. At that time there was some opposition expressed as to the wisdom of having a central fingerprint identification unit in Washington. The committee provided funds for the transfer, however, and with the passing of the years, fingerprint annexations have shown a steady growth until today there are upward of 5,700,000 of these fingerprints located here in Washington. At the present time some 9,300 different local police departments, sheriffs' offices, State police units, and so forth, are contributing fingerprints of criminals to be placed on file. Approximately 4,000 of these prints are received each day in the Bureau and search made to determine whether a previous criminal record is shown. Last year, of the total prints received, nearly 50 percent were found to represent prints of individuals who had been previously fingerprinted and who possessed a criminal record. Hand in hand with this development has arisen a cooperative fingerprint exchange with all foreign countries of major note in the world. Of the thousand-odd foreign prints received of international criminals, 256 identifications were made from these foreign prints.

By the operations of this clearing house for crime detection, 4,403 persons were identified during the past fiscal year as being fugitives from justice.

One of the most engrossing aspects of the entire fingerprint collection, at least to the layman, is the fact that when a print has been received, it requires but 5 minutes from the time of receipt until a determination may be had as to whether the individual whose prints are represented by the card has a previous criminal record.

A crime-prevention laboratory has been established and is daily engaged in applying scientific principles to the detection of crime.

In addition to the criminal identification work, the Bureau has been endeavoring to educate the mass of public opinion in the United States of the wisdom and desirability of civil fingerprints. The results of this program are to be found in the fact that over 100,000 of these civil fingerprints are now on file in the Bureau and numbered among them are many leaders in the business, economic, and political life of the country. This file serves as a medium for identifying amnesia victims and missing persons. The stigma of fingerprinting is rapidly being erased.

Sixty-two investigations have been performed by agents of the Bureau in kidnaping cases. Every case has been solved; and while all persons identified with each kidnaping have not been apprehended, some arrests have been made in each case.

It should be noted that Federal police authority has been extended to embrace the robbery of national banks and those insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, thus placing over 14,000 banks under the Federal police authority. A decrease of nearly 50 percent in robberies of these banks is mute evidence of the respect entertained by the criminal for this authority.

In addition to the criminal work of the Bureau, the investigation of war-risk insurance cases has occupied a considerable amount of the time of the special agents. Over 6,000 of these cases have been investigated since the work was taken over from the Veterans' Administration in September of 1933, and savings to the Government in the amounts claimed, but not allowed, aggregate nearly \$72,000,000.

The enactment of several measures during the past 2 years making Federal crimes those that were formerly cognizable only by State authority has added materially to the work load of the Bureau. Constant overtime work is being performed by the personnel of the Bureau, and nearly 7,000



cases are on hand that have not been assigned to agents, due simply to their inability to handle additional work. The case load of each agent at the present time is approximately 15 cases, while experience shows that a reasonable average is 10 cases.

In the light of the foregoing facts and the first-hand evidence the committee has had of the efficient operation of the Bureau, we are recommending to the consideration of the House an increase of \$225,000 in the Budget estimates. If allowed, the appropriation for the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the fiscal year 1937 will be \$6,025,000, an increase of \$1,025,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year. In addition to this actual increase of \$225,000, certain activities upon which the Bureau is now engaged have been taken from its jurisdiction, and the expense of these activities has been provided at another point in the bill at a cost of \$75,000. I shall discuss this matter at a later point in my remarks, but I think it proper here to make reference to the fact that the effect of being relieved of this work is to afford a total increase of \$300,000 rather than \$225,000. It should be borne in mind in making a factual appraisal of the financial needs of this organization that during the past fiscal year, fines, recoveries, and savings to citizens of the United States amounted to \$38,500,000 in round numbers. During the past fiscal year 2,930 automobiles were recovered. The Director has assured the committee that with an increased appropriation the ratio of savings to the amount appropriated can be maintained, if not increased. The increased allowance will permit the appointment of additional agents and clerks in order that pending cases may be assigned and adequate attention given to the ever-present problem of crime.

Taxes and penalties unit: The next item of increase over the estimates is in connection with the taxes and penalties unit of the Department. The Budget has estimated \$200,000. The committee recommends \$220,000. With an appropriation of \$225,000, recoveries amounting to approximately \$450,000 were made in the fiscal year 1935. These recoveries have fully justified the position taken by the committee some 2 years ago when it authorized appropriation of funds for the establishment of this unit. A case has but recently been decided in the Supreme Court which will effect an immediate recovery of some \$265,000, and following the points of law settled in the case, additional recoveries in other cases are anticipated. For the information of those who are not conversant with the work that this unit is doing, I might say that it is devoted principally to considering over 60,000 cases made during the prohibition era with a view to collecting civil penalties for the nonpayment of the Government tax on the illicit intoxicants. This involves in its wake suits on bonds against surety companies, forfeiture of vehicle bonds, and so forth.

Examination of judicial offices: Last year the committee transferred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation the work of examining judicial offices. Due to the stress of criminal investigative activities, it has not been possible for the agents of the Bureau to devote the time that is necessary for the proper accomplishment of this work. At the present time there appear on the Government books sums totaling \$3,400,000 in uncollected fines, forfeitures, judgments, and so forth, in the various judicial districts. With the passing of time the possibilities of collecting much of this credit balance disappear. The committee therefore has inserted an item of \$75,000 for the establishment of a special corps of expert examiners under the direction of the Attorney General to visit the offices of clerks and marshals in the numerous judicial districts and apply their time and energy to the collection of these accounts. While this will be the primary duty of the examiners, they will also engage themselves in auditing the accounts of marshals and clerks. The effect of this recommendation, if approved, will be to relieve the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of this more or less routine task of examination and at the same time supply a corps of trained examiners that can probably make collections of these past due obligations in amounts more than offsetting the \$75,000 provided.

LXXX—305

The major item of decrease in the Department proper is to be found in the appropriation provided for veterans' insurance litigation. The committee is recommending a reduction of \$50,000 in the Budget estimates due to the falling off of the work of defending the interests of the Government in litigation arising out of war-risk insurance cases.

Small increases have been allowed for the appointment of additional United States attorneys, their assistants, marshals, and clerks, to keep pace with the growing volume of court business. Expenses for the various courts—Supreme Court, Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, Customs Court, and the Territorial courts—are all substantially the same as this year.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. On the question of United States attorneys and marshals, while I appreciate the splendid work my colleague and his committee have done—and they have done splendid work—I am doubtful as to the wisdom or propriety of carrying \$35,000 in this bill for training United States attorneys.

Mr. McMILLAN. If my colleague will wait a moment, I will get to that question.

Mr. BLANTON. I wanted to put my colleague on notice that I am going to feel constrained to make a point of order against that item, because I do not think that there is any authority of law for it. I think they ought to be trained before they are appointed. [Laughter.]

Mr. McMILLAN. I may say to my colleague that I will go into that question in a few minutes.

#### PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

In keeping with the general upward trend in the volume of business of the Department, provision has been made for additional sums at practically all of the penal institutions throughout the country. With the repeal of prohibition it was the thought of many informed persons that there would be a material lessening in the amount of court business and that the need for additional prison facilities would disappear. The reverse has been true. An ever-increasing prison population, gradual but nonetheless definite, has brought us to a condition where our penal and correctional institutions are in many instances taxed to capacity to house the prison population. Federal jails have been built, Federal prison camps have been established, and still there exists a need for additional facilities.

In the forefront of my remarks I touched upon the estimate of \$4,900,000 for a building program under the supervision of the Bureau of Prisons. The Budget estimate provided for certain extensions to existing plants, dwelling houses for prison employees, new Federal jails, and the development of the McNeil Island area. Instead of recommending \$4,900,000 your committee asks your concurrence in an appropriation of \$2,850,000. This sum, if approved, will permit \$550,000 to be devoted to building at the El Reno, Okla., Reformatory; construction of a detention building at the Springfield Hospital for Defective Delinquents and certain additions to the women's penitentiary at Alderson, W. Va. For dwelling houses for the prison employees \$300,000 will be made available. At some institutions where adequate housing facilities are not available it is deemed to be in the best interests of the Government to provide dwelling houses for prison employees and their families. Not only is the problem of housing thus answered but means are afforded of having the employees on the grounds of the institution, where, should an emergency arise, they will be available. Rents are charged the employees, and under the accounting procedure the cost of building is amortized in 20 years, exclusive of maintenance costs. We think that it is desirable to start the program on a comparatively small scale, and as needs become acute in the future, additional appropriations can be provided to meet them.

Included also among the construction items is an amount of \$300,000 which the committee feels should be made available for developing the McNeil Island area in order that proper facilities may be afforded the employees of that institution who will live on the island. The island is located some little



distance from the mainland, so it is very desirable to have the employees housed thereon.

The balance of the amount provided for construction is made up of \$1,700,000 to provide three new Federal jails. The Director of the Bureau of Prisons, in his representations before the committee, requested funds and authority to construct six of these institutions. It is felt, however, that the need for additional penal housing facilities can at least be considerably ameliorated with the three jails that can be constructed with the sums the committee has allowed.

The estimate for maintenance of prisoners in the various penal institutions appears to be on the conservative side; in fact, in some few institutions there are more prisoners housed today than have been provided for under the sums requested for the maintenance of the institutions during the next fiscal year. Accordingly, the increased amounts requested at each of the several institutions, with the sole exception of Alcatraz Island, have been approved. It has appeared to the committee, however, that the amount estimated for support of prisoners is excessive. This item bears the expense of maintaining Federal prisoners in State, city, and county jails, and the estimate was based upon an anticipated confinement of 7,705 prisoners throughout the next fiscal year. The average at this time is in the neighborhood of 5,600. We have reduced the estimate of \$2,500,000 to \$2,000,000, which will provide an average of over 6,000 prisoners throughout the next fiscal year. It would seem to the committee that this is a fair approximation as to the number that might necessarily be housed in these local jails in the next fiscal year.

I think I should make some mention of the probation system. With the funds provided by the bill it will be possible to employ 173 probation officers and 12 clerks to carry out the program of probation, which has had such an astounding growth in the past few years. The hearings will give an interesting picture of the growth of this system, and I commend their reading to any Members of the House who may be interested. The case load of some probation officers is too large to permit them to give adequate supervision to their probationers, but we are endeavoring to gradually work out the problem so that the system may function efficiently and accomplish the desired reformation of the wards placed in its care.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEY. Can the gentleman tell us the average age of the prisoners in Federal prisons?

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not think I can tell the gentleman offhand, but the record will probably disclose that. The highest average of the criminal doing his work in the country, I may say, is 19 years, according to the records of the Bureau.

Mr. KENNEY. I understood it was about that.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. McMILLAN. For the Department of Commerce the Budget has submitted estimates totaling \$34,264,175. The committee is recommending the appropriation of \$34,054,700, a reduction of \$209,475 in the Budget estimates and \$959,700 under the appropriation for the current fiscal year. While the reduction of about \$210,000 in the Budget estimates for this Department is small in comparison with the reductions made in the other three departments in the bill, it should be borne in mind that no construction was provided for the next fiscal year. Again, the amount recommended is just short of \$1,000,000 less than the appropriation for the current year, so the opportunities for effecting further saving without impairing some necessary function of the Department were extremely limited.

As a whole, it is felt that the amount that we are asking you to approve represents practically the minimum needs of the Department to accomplish the many duties placed upon it by law.

Bureau of Air Commerce: With the exception of the Bureau of Lighthouses, the appropriation for the Bureau of Air Commerce is the largest of any bureau under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. During the past fiscal

year the Bureau was supplied with funds amounting to \$5,909,800. If the recommendation of the committee is concurred in by the House the sum of \$6,264,000 will be made available for expenditure, an increase of \$354,200 over the 1936 appropriation. At this time the Senate Committee on Commerce is conducting an investigation of the Bureau of Air Commerce. Certain charges have been made by witnesses appearing before that committee which, if true, would seem to reflect upon the administration of the Bureau. As yet, however, no opportunity has been afforded the Department officials to present their side of the argument. The committee, in the limited time available for conducting the hearings covering the ramified activities of four major departments of the Government, has necessarily had to limit the scope of its inquiry to matters touching on the need for funds to operate the different bureaus.

One matter which has disturbed us, however, is the fact that funds that had been appropriated with the understanding that they would be used for strictly maintenance work have been diverted to other purposes. To prevent such an occurrence in the future, we have rearranged the appropriation headings in the bill under four major headings: (1) Salaries, District of Columbia; (2) Air regulation; (3) Extension of airways development and experimental work; (4) Maintenance. With this new grouping, it is felt that the purposes of the administration will be better served and the committee will be secure in the knowledge that the funds, if used at all, will be used for the purposes appropriated. We have increased the Budget estimates for the total appropriation by \$44,000 and have denied the increased personnel that the Bureau requested for the next fiscal year. This will result in making available approximately \$260,000 for extension of airway routes. Many of the airways over which passengers are carried daily in the United States are not equipped with safety facilities or lights for night flying. While this modest amount will assist somewhat in meeting what we regard as an absolute need for additional radio aids, lighting facilities, and other assistance on these routes, it will not serve to answer the general problem of protection which I feel it is the duty of this Government to afford passengers traveling by air. The science of aeronautics, of course, has been developing with extreme rapidity and measures of safety that today might be considered sufficient, tomorrow may become obsolete. It is probable that there will have to be a reappraisal of the whole question of governmental aid in this field in the immediate future, and pending that determination we must not go too far in authorizing expenditures that may turn out in the future to be both ill-advised and costly.

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: For the information of those not already aware of the fact, Mr. A. V. Dye, who has been for many years connected with the foreign service of the Commerce Department, has recently been appointed Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The recognition of the services of a man who has made a career of this service by his appointment as Director augurs well for the fulfillment of the hope that the committee has cherished for some time that the foreign service of the Department of Commerce may be made a career service comparable with that of the State Department.

In almost every instance the request for additional personnel for extending the assistance rendered to business by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has been disallowed. With the all-apparent need for economy, we have not considered it wise to increase the expenses of the Government in this direction at the present time. Until world conditions somewhat stabilize we should hold a check-rein on activities which must depend upon a basis of common understanding among the nations of the world for the complete fulfillment of their aims.

The appropriations for the Census Bureau, Bureau of Standards, Bureau of Lighthouses, and the Bureau of Fisheries are recommended to be maintained at the approximate level of expenditure as exists during the present fiscal year.



**Coast and Geodetic Survey:** The Coast and Geodetic Survey has been allowed funds to increase the period of their boat operation by 1 month on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. This work entails the compilation of data which is subsequently charted in the office of the Bureau in Washington and serves to indicate ocean depth and coast configuration. A mass of data has accumulated in the Washington office as a result of expenditure of P. W. A. funds for surveying work in the interior of the country, and some additional personnel has been allowed in order to chart the work and make it available to the public. I might mention here that there are some 28 distinct units of the Government engaged in some form of surveying and mapping activities. Doubtless, with the proper coordination or centralization of this authority, considerable economy of operation could be made. It is to be hoped that the Senate committee which has been constituted to study the reorganization of the Government will give some consideration to this problem.

**Bureau of Fisheries:** The Bureau of Fisheries has continued to operate in its sphere of activity, which embraces the stocking of ponds and lakes throughout the country and in making studies of fish migration, habits, food value, marketing possibilities, and so forth. The fur-seal herd on the Pribiloff Islands is in a very healthy condition and is increasing at the rate of about 8 percent per year. In 1911, the low point, the herd numbered only 123,600, whereas this year it numbers upward of 1,500,000 head. During the past year 57,000 sealskins were taken, which surpassed the record take of some 47 years ago. The output of smaller fishes used for stocking purposes increased about one and one-half billion over the previous year.

**Patent Office:** The Patent Office continues to maintain itself on the credit side of the ledger. The excess of receipts over expenditures last year amounted to about \$111,000. The arrearage in the disposition of applications for patents has been materially reduced, and considerable progress is being made in the classification of patents. This classification work expedites the search made of existing patents when applications are received and as the system of classification is extended, the time consumed by employees in disposing of patent applications is correspondingly reduced. The committee has made some reductions in the estimates submitted for the Patent Office, but it is felt that with the amount allowed it will be possible to keep current with the work and present an encouraging picture of accomplishment when the Director appears before the committee next year.

**Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection:** The only increase over the Budget estimates recommended for any bureau of the Department of Commerce other than the Air Commerce Bureau is to be found in the paragraph providing funds for the Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection.

During the course of the testimony given by the Director of this Bureau it developed that with the present force of steamboat inspectors employed by the Bureau it is impossible to make the inspections and reinspections of vessels which are provided by law. The Director informed the committee that in his judgment in order to perform all necessary inspections of vessels to insure protection of life and property at sea it would require 111 additional assistant inspectors and 25 additional clerks. Public opinion has been aroused as a result of the *Mohawk* and *Morro Castle* disasters to the necessity for the Government's tightening up the regulations with respect to the operation of vessels. Whatever rules might be prescribed to increase the safety standards might just as well remain unpromulgated if adequate manpower is not provided to make the inspections to see that the rules and regulations, so prescribed, are carried out.

We have given this matter serious thought, with the result that we are asking the House to sustain an increase in the Budget estimates of \$167,500, which will provide between 40 and 50 additional traveling steamboat inspectors and some few clerks. While I am hesitant to suggest increases over the amount of the President's Budget, I do feel that we would be derelict in our duty as Members of the House knowing this condition to exist if we did not take some steps to remedy it.

**Shipping Board Bureau and Emergency Fleet Corporation:** The most important change that the committee is recommending in the appropriations for the Shipping Board Bureau and the Emergency Fleet Corporation is to permit additional funds to be used for maintaining the laid-up fleet. There are some 158 vessels owned by the Corporation, the actual condition of which is unknown. Maintenance funds are being used yearly to grease the machinery and make minor repairs in order that the boats might be put into condition in the event of an emergency. The condition of the boats below the waterline, however, is unknown. It is quite possible that money is being spent for maintenance on boats that would be of no service at all and which could quite properly be junked. It is only by drydocking and examining the hulls of these boats that determination may be had of their exact condition. It seems to us that this work of drydocking should be done in order that we may save the expense of maintaining boats that are unfit for use. We have inserted language in the bill which will permit the use of Emergency Fleet Corporation funds to accomplish this purpose.

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

With the exceptions of the two items for construction and repair of immigration stations and for the expenses of maintaining the liaison office with the International Labor Organization, we are recommending reductions under the Budget estimates in each paragraph providing appropriations for the Labor Department.

If the House approves all of the committee recommendations, the bill will carry a total of \$21,697,000 for this Department. This will represent a reduction of \$3,766,500 under the Budget estimates. It is, however, an increase of \$2,367,000 as compared with the appropriations for this year. If deduction is made of the additional amounts recommended to be appropriated under the Children's Bureau to carry out the provisions of the Social Security Act which fall under the administrative jurisdiction of that Bureau, there would be a net decrease of approximately \$460,000 under the total appropriations for the present fiscal year. So long as Congress continues to pass laws requiring additional expenditures of public moneys it will not be possible for your Appropriations Committee to show a reduction in the appropriations required to carry out the will of Congress as expressed in their legislative enactments.

**Children's Bureau:** Let us first consider the committee action on the matter of these appropriations for the Children's Bureau. The supplemental appropriation bill recently signed by the President contained funds to carry out various sections of the Social Security Act pertaining to maternal and child care by making apportionments to States for the 5-month period from February 1 to July 1. In the bill now before you amounts are carried under the three separate headings of, first, maternal and child health; second, aid to crippled children; and, third, child welfare service, all to provide for these State apportionments from July 1, 1936, to July 1, 1937. We are recommending a reduction in the Budget estimates under each of these three heads, as it does not appear at this time that all of the States will be in a position to avail themselves of the entire allotment under each of the separate sections.

I will not detain the House to go into a labored account of the calculations that entered into our decision as to just the amount that we feel is the proper figure to provide, but I can say that on the strength of the evidence presented to us I do feel that the sums we are proposing for appropriation will be sufficient to meet every demand from the States for these moneys. The Social Security Act provides specific authorizations for appropriations under each of these three previously mentioned headings and the Budget estimate in each instance represented the maximum authorization under the law. In order to assure to all the States the proportionate share they would be entitled to on the basis of an appropriation of the entire amount authorized, we have inserted language in each of these three items permitting allocations to the States to be made on the basis of the total authorization rather than on the basis of the appropriation. If it thus develops that the States take up their allotments



more rapidly than we anticipate, it is possible that it will be necessary to provide additional funds in the deficiency bill next year to meet this contingency.

There is one more important change in this matter that we submit to the consideration of the House. Under the terms of part 1, title V, of the Social Security Act, which is the paragraph relating to grants for maternal and child health, a sum of \$980,000 is authorized to be allotted to the States on the basis of the "financial need" of each State, with the factors constituting "financial need" left to the administrative discretion of the Secretary of Labor. As might well be expected with the delegation of such a blanket authority, considerable difficulty is being experienced in obtaining a satisfactory formula that will accurately express "financial need" of any given State for these Federal grants. In finally arriving at a solution the Secretary has approved a formula which is arrived at by multiplying the excessive infant mortality and excessive maternal mortality in any State by the number of live births in such State. By then adding a small uniform apportionment to each State allotments are made which are presumed to be the embodiment of the "financial need" requirement of the law. Frankly, the committee sees neither rhyme nor reason in the approach that has been made to making the allotments under this "financial need" provision. Aside from this feature, we regard this part of the law as a dangerous delegation of legislative authority that is not circumscribed by sufficient definition as to what factors are to be taken into account in arriving at a formula for determining "financial need." The committee has inserted a provision, therefore, prohibiting the allotment of money to the States under this authorization, and has provided instead that the \$980,000 shall be allotted in accordance with the authorization for allotments made on the basis of the total live births in each State, as compared with the total live births in the United States.

**Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization:** The estimates for the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization have been reduced by \$110,000.

During the past year there has been a remarkable increase in the applications for citizenship. It is probable that this trend can be attributed to two factors: One, a general scramble to climb on the good boat "Social Security"—citizenship being a prerequisite to qualification for benefits—and the other, a prevailing fear that wholesale deportations of aliens may be effected in the not too far distant future. If the total appropriation for the Bureau of \$9,740,000 is approved, it will permit the use of about \$155,000 for the appointment of additional naturalization examiners and clerks to cope with this increased business. A system of uniform requirements is being worked out to apply to those seeking naturalization. This will replace the most unsatisfactory system heretofore extant, whereby the individual naturalization examiner prescribed his own questions to determine the fitness of an alien for citizenship.

Immigration and naturalization frauds at the port of New York have occupied the intensive attention of the Bureau. In all, 49 prosecutions have been made and 39 convictions have resulted.

**Conciliation Service:** The unconstitutionality of the National Recovery Act has resulted in a measurable increase in responsibilities of the Conciliation Service. Many of the labor boards organized under the authority of the act went out of existence and their work was taken over by this unit; among these were the National Labor Relations Board, National Steel Labor Relations Board, Textile Labor Relations Board, and the Petroleum Labor Policy Board. During the next fiscal year we are recommending a reduction of \$90,300 under the Budget estimate of \$488,300. If the volume of business should continue to grow, proper representations may be made to the committee during the next session of Congress.

**Bureau of Labor Statistics:** The appropriations for the Bureau of Labor Statistics have had astounding growth. Two years ago the appropriation amounted to \$414,000. For next year, a request is made for the approval of an appropriation of \$884,600 to prepare the many statistical compila-

tions the Bureau desires to make. If economy is to be something accomplished and not merely an empty word, perhaps the most fertile field for effecting savings is by the elimination of statistical studies that have but little use to the public at large. I do not want to make the inference by this statement that all of the statistics compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics fall within that category. It is true, however, that we are presented with a condition and not a theory of one unit of the Government, the appropriations for which have more than doubled in a space of 2 years' time. Many of the agencies of the Government have seen continued reductions in the appropriations made since 1932. The appropriations for other branches have remained practically static for many years, although there has been a constant demand from the public at large for additional service to be rendered.

In the light of these facts, the committee feels that we should begin to retrench in matters involving statistical work where the results attained are such as to serve only a comparatively small group of interested beneficiaries. We are asking you, therefore, to sustain us in a reduction under the Budget estimates of \$136,600. If this reduction is approved there will still remain available \$748,000 for the work of the Bureau next year, which is a sum greater by \$200,000 than the appropriation for the past fiscal year.

**Employment Service:** By the terms of the Wagner-Peyser Act, approved June 6, 1933, a system of State employment agencies has been set up, supported by Federal, State, and local funds. Agreements of affiliation are entered into by the States with the Employment Service in Washington whereby the States agree to certain stipulations as to the character of the employment service maintained. When this affiliation has been achieved, Federal funds are made available to the different States, which must agree to spend a like sum out of State and local funds. During the present fiscal year \$2,425,000 was appropriated for apportionment to the States. Under the provisions of the act, apportionments not availed of by States at the end of 2 years are pooled and reapportioned among all 48 States. It is indicated at the present time that on July 1 of this year there will be about \$1,100,000, representing the unused portion of the 1934 and 1935 appropriations, which will, under the terms of the act, be reapportioned among all of the States. The Wagner-Peyser Act authorizes an annual appropriation of \$3,000,000 for these State grants. In view of the fact that \$1,100,000 is to be reapportioned among all of the States and territories on July 1, we are recommending for your consideration a reduction in the appropriation for the next fiscal year of the amount that will be reapportioned. To make it clear, instead of appropriating \$3,000,000, as authorized by the act, we are asking you to appropriate \$1,900,000. This amount, plus the \$1,100,000 which will be reapportioned on the 1st of July, will make available the \$3,000,000 authorized. In order to protect the apportionments to States that have not yet affiliated with the act, a provision was inserted in the bill last year authorizing apportionments to be made on the basis of an appropriation of \$3,000,000, even though the actual appropriation made was only \$2,425,000. We have inserted language to continue this permissive apportionment for States qualifying for the first time, in order that they may not lose the amounts which have been credited to them and which serve in encouraging them to affiliate. We do not think it is desirable to continue to appropriate \$3,000,000 for these allotments each year, the effect of which will be but to build up a large unavailed of amount credited to the different States. Only six States at the present time have taken up the entire amount apportioned to them, and if our recommendation to you is approved, they will continue to receive the same apportionment that they would receive under a \$3,000,000 appropriation. The only amount that they would be deprived of would be money that would accrue to them as a result of the failure of other States to affiliate.

The money allowed for the Veterans' Placement Service, the Farm Placement Service, the District of Columbia Public Employment Center, and the defraying of administrative



costs, has been increased from a limitation of \$775,000 to \$885,000 in order that additional personnel may be added to handle the additional burdens placed upon the service as a result of the States becoming affiliated. The status of this whole program has been developed quite fully in the hearings, and I recommend its study to those having a particular interest in the development of this program.

Appropriations for the Women's Bureau, Labor Standards, and the Housing Corporation are recommended to be maintained at substantially the same totals as provided this year, the request for additional personnel in the first two named units having been denied by the committee.

In closing may I express to the Members of the House my appreciation for the courtesy which you have displayed in bearing with me in this summary of the committee's work. Should any of you wish to ask questions about any of the matters that I have touched on or, in fact, on any matters connected with the appropriations for the four Departments, I shall endeavor to answer them or supply such information as you may desire. Thank you for your attention. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] has expired.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH].

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, today I introduced a resolution which reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this House that during a Presidential election year it is offensive to American political traditions and subversive of the principles of sound Government to permit the chairman of any national political party to function also as a Cabinet Officer in charge of so vital a national service as the Post Office Department; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be communicated to the President of the United States with the respectful recommendation that he require the immediate resignation of the Postmaster General from either his political post, as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, or from his Cabinet office.

I believe that the House will agree to that resolution when it comes up for consideration.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman think he can get the resolution by the Committee on Rules—and I ask that question because the gentleman is a member of that committee?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Oh, I know of 1, 2, 3, 4—oh, 14—votes in the Rules Committee that will be cast for that resolution.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it the gentleman's prophesy that the House will vote for this resolution if and when it comes up?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I think the House will vote for it if and when it comes up, and I stake my reputation as a political forecaster on that statement—if and when it comes up, it will be adopted.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Could we have a vote on that now?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for a parliamentary inquiry. Speaking seriously, the people of the country under general, ordinary circumstances are not very much interested in the civil service, because when the agencies of the Government function efficiently as they normally do and have in the past half century, there is nothing to get excited about. It is just like a person in possession of good health. He does not worry about it so long as his health is good, but when he becomes ill then the question of good health is of prime importance. The Government agencies have recently come to function so that it is a concern of the people. Just within a week the results of a poll upon the question of the application of the merit system to the governmental civil service was taken, and the result showed that 88 percent of the people indicated their desire for a return to the merit system in Government agencies, to the end that efficiency in Government activities be restored.

The merit system was introduced by the Pendleton Act in 1883. By that act, in 1884, 10 percent of the civilian employees of the Government were placed under the civil service—that is, under the merit system. Those best qualified to do the work got the jobs, and those who were doing the work acceptably and efficiently retained their jobs. That is the merit system. By 1904, 30 years ago, 50 percent of the employees of the Government were under the merit system.

ice—that is, under the merit system. Those best qualified to do the work got the jobs, and those who were doing the work acceptably and efficiently retained their jobs. That is the merit system. By 1904, 30 years ago, 50 percent of the employees of the Government were under the merit system.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. Can the gentleman explain to us how it is that during Republican administrations they managed to get about 90 percent of every branch of the departments strictly under the merit system and how everyone in every sort of a job came to be a Republican?

Mr. LEHLBACH. In the first place, I think the gentleman is in error in his statement, but inasmuch as the merit system gives opportunity to the one best fitted to do the job, naturally and normally the majority of the job holders would be Republican. In 1904 half of the employees of the Government were under the merit system. On June 30, 1933, before the present administration and its national Democratic chairman began to function as a member of the Cabinet, 80 percent of everyone performing work for Uncle Sam who did not wear a uniform got his place by reason of the merit system and held it by reason of the merit system. Every administration from that of President Arthur to President Roosevelt showed an increase of employees under the merit system. In 3 years we have scrapped 30 years of advance of the civil-service system and are back to where we were in 1904, when barely more than half of the employees of the Federal Government are now under the merit system under civil service, and almost half of them are purely and solely appointed because of their political affiliations and the party work they have performed.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. I ask the gentleman if all of those who were under the civil service before the New Deal and its new departments are not still under the same rules and regulations of the merit system; and is it not true that those the gentleman speaks of who are not under the civil service are to be found in the hastily constructed organizations under the New Deal?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I am very glad that the gentleman has asked that question, and I shall proceed to answer it. Although the regular and permanent departments of the Government have been greatly augmented since June 30, 1933, in respect of personnel, there are now in the regular departments less people under civil service than there were in June 1933, and the fact is that it is the only time in a half century of our history that there has not been an increase and extension of the civil-service system with respect to Government employees.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield.

Mr. CREAL. Can the gentleman name one single department that has always been under civil service which has been taken out of civil service?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes. We have collectors of internal revenue throughout the country. When their business increased to the point where they had to have deputies to act in their stead who went in the field to examine taxable sources, these deputy collectors were, of course, not placed under civil service because they were in a personal and fiduciary relationship to the collector, and all effort heretofore to put them under civil service has been resisted. But in the office of collectors of internal revenue those who were not functioning as deputy collectors, those who worked in the office in a clerical capacity, were put under civil service. In order to make vacancies for patronage appointments in this administration, the practice has grown up, for instance, when they want to get rid of a girl who has been there for years as a stenographer to make room for the daughter of a man to whom a political debt is owed, they transfer the stenographer and appoint her as a deputy collector. Instead of appointing her to another position as stenographer, typist, or clerk, where she would be protected under civil service, they strip her of civil-service protection



and in a week or so fire her, because a deputy collector is not under civil service; and they put on the Democratic girl as a clerk or stenographer and throw around her the aegis of the civil service. This has happened in countless offices throughout the country. That is one instance.

Another instance is that when by an Executive order of the President bureaus or parts of bureaus are consolidated or transferred under the Economy Act, the Executive order states that the activity is deemed to be abolished, although it is only transferred; and every employee in the abolished activity is stripped of civil service, and so discharged. The employee could be rehired within 4 months, either temporarily or under a permanent appointment, in which event his or her civil-service status was restored.

This is how it worked: Post-office buildings throughout the country used to be under the care of the Treasury Department, the postal activities being carried on under the Post Office Department. The precious chairman of your national committee saw opportunities for those whom he considered worthy of reward by appointment to positions as cleaners, elevator men, furnace tenders, and so forth, in these post offices. An Executive order was issued under the Economy Act transferring the custody of post-office buildings from the Treasury Department to the Post Office Department. In every instance heretofore the Treasury Department had appointed the postmaster as the custodian acting for the Treasury Department, which meant simply that John Jones, custodian of the building under the Treasury Department, was also John Jones, postmaster. John Jones had control of the custodial forces in his building, no longer as a representative of the Treasury Department but as a representative of the Post Office Department. The same work went on, the same personnel was there, everything was the same except this figment of change of control; but the Executive order said that every man who worked in the post office lacked a civil-service status.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to take issue with the gentleman, but I know it to be a fact that the custodial force in the Boston post office is under civil service. About 2 years ago the existing civil-service list was canceled. As the gentleman knows, of course, where a list is canceled or expires temporary appointments can be made. Those are not civil-service appointments. Those men served for about a year until the new examination took place and a new list was established. Then the temporary employees lost their positions because they were temporary and without a civil-service status. Those who were appointed were taken from the new civil-service list of names certified under the law in the order of their standing on the list. I do not know anything about any other part of the country, but I do know about Boston.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The gentleman corroborated me completely by his statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know how I corroborate the gentleman.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be glad to be enlightened.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The force of employees, the janitors, the cleaners, the men who run the heating apparatus, the furnace tenders, the common laborers engaged about the building would number between 20 and 30 I would imagine in a city like Boston. They were by Executive order stripped of their civil-service status.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; they were not. They are there. Those men were not disturbed. It related only to the new post-office building. They had to have additional help. The old help is still there with their civil-service protection. This applied only to the new appointees.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The gentleman is misinformed with respect to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know whereof I speak, because it is from experience.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I should like to corroborate the gentleman's statement. So far as my town is concerned it is identical with what the gentleman states about Boston.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from New Jersey, I know, would not make a misstatement of fact. I have great respect for him. I ask the gentleman to make further investigation. I should like to know, because I do not know of any case in Boston where any of the old employees were disturbed.

It is true the postmaster is the custodian, but he has a man appointed to whom he looks, and every one of the old employees—the elevator men, the laborers, and those in the classified and unclassified service, who were there 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 years ago, are still there, and what I said applies only to new appointees where vacancies exist.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The gentleman, of course, is fortunate in his local situation, but that does not alter the fact that every one of the employees in the Boston office in the course of 1933 was stripped of their civil-service status. It was up to the postmaster whether he would reemploy the employee within 4 months, and restore civil-service status, or employ other people. This opportunity existed and was availed of in hundreds of post offices throughout the country in order to make these petty little jobs patronage.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I know is that in Boston there was not a person disturbed.

Mr. LEHLBACH. That was a very fortunate situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that in connection with civil-service positions I do not care what a person's politics may be. They have earned it. They have taken a civil-service examination and their names have been certified. Where people live in my district, and who have been certified, I do everything I can to assist them in obtaining an appointment.

Mr. LEHLBACH. But the fact is that although the permanent establishment of the Government has been increased in personnel by thousands, there are less under civil-service protection in the permanent establishment today than there were in June 1933. It is the first time in a half century that such a condition has existed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true also that in certain post offices particular groups, such as motor-vehicle mechanics—and this applies to Boston—have been abolished and there was no opportunity allowed for substitutes to be promoted?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I believe that is so.

Mr. Chairman, take the Federal Radio Commission, which was changed to the Federal Communications Commission and some additional functions added with respect to telegraph and telephone. Essentially that Commission performs the same function as the old Radio Commission.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say, with reference to what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] said, that there was a classification abolished throughout the entire country. There were seven in Boston who received promotions through increase in grade. The old grade was abolished throughout the country. There were 14 substitutes held back, and we tried to help them out, but certain of the old grades were abolished throughout the country.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes; and the work was done by temporary employees not under civil service.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no; under civil service. Every employee is under the civil service.

Mr. DOBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. DOBBINS. The gentleman stated that there are hundreds of post offices where the custodial employees enjoying civil service have been let out. Will the gentleman name just three?



Mr. LEHLBACH. I have not the names with me right now.

Mr. DOBBINS. Name a single civil-service employee who lost his job by reason of the transfer orders to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I can get the names of hundreds of them.

Mr. DOBBINS. I do not believe the gentleman can name one single instance that has occurred, because I have investigated those charges before, and I found them utterly unsubstantiated.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Maybe this is all unsubstantiated, too.

Mr. DOBBINS. I am alluding to the gentleman's charge that civil-service employees have lost their civil-service status.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The proof of that is in reading the Executive orders which abolished these positions.

Mr. DOBBINS. The gentleman made the statement and I assumed he had the proof.

Mr. LEHLBACH. These Executive orders allows them to be rehired on a temporary basis without any civil-service status at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman from New Jersey in favor of the same system of civil service that was carried on during the administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, or is he in favor of an entirely new program?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I am in favor of continuation of the Civil Service System as it was carried on in this country from 1883 to 1933.

Mr. BLANTON. We have been carrying it on just like the gentleman's administrations did.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Oh, my gracious, no. When the last administration went out 80 percent of the people drawing pay from the Federal Government, and I do not include those who wore a military uniform, were under the civil service, while a bare majority of them at the present time are under the civil service.

Mr. BLANTON. All during the last three Republican administrations whenever a civil-service list for a postmaster-ship would be announced, and the three highest who were the eligibles on the list were not Republicans they would call for a new examination. They would keep on calling for new examinations until a satisfactory Republican appeared as one of the three eligibles on the list.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The statement of the gentleman from Texas is interesting if true. I do not know about that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I may say that I had 159 postmasters under my jurisdiction and I never thought of changing the postmasters in the smaller offices. We did change one or two in the larger offices. Now the orders go out—and the gentleman is perfectly aware of this—that if a Democrat can qualify, no matter how small the office may be, he gets the job. At least they did that in my district. Now, does anybody doubt that statement?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that in my home town, where there are five employees in the post office in addition to the postmaster, the Department refused to take any action until the term of the postmasters expired. At that time they took my recommendation, and I, of course, appointed a Democrat as postmaster. I undertook later to change the janitor in the building and I was told that position was under civil service. I could not get a disabled veteran in my home town appointed as janitor in the post office. On the other hand, they sent a man over from Ohio to take the job.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The gentleman seems to lack sufficient tensile strength.

Mr. MAY. I had the difficulty of being up against the law while the other fellow had the law in his hands.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Here is a sample of what happened to the permanent establishments in this administration when the Federal Radio Commission was rigged up as the Communications Commission. Under the set-up of the Federal Radio Commission every employee, except the five Commissioners, was under civil service—every single one of them. Some of them were in class A, which means that the position is not competitive, but nevertheless is under the supervision of the Civil Service Commission and the qualifications set up by the Civil Service Commission must be possessed by the person appointed to such a position. Those who were in the non-competitive class were these: The attorneys, assistant attorneys, and special assistant attorneys; that is, the legal staff, which was comparatively small, and the lawyers retained for special cases. These were not in the competitive class, but in a general sense were under the control and supervision of the Civil Service Commission with respect to their appointment.

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield.

Mr. MORITZ. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the Pittsburgh post office they were all Democratic appointees, and they had to take the civil-service examination, and almost all of them failed, which shows that the civil service is trying to function properly.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Did they all fail?

Mr. MORITZ. Almost all the Democratic appointees failed in their examination, and now they are trying to retain their jobs, but it seems they cannot do this. In other words, the civil service is functioning right, and they are following the merit system.

Mr. LEHLBACH. They must have even a worse class of Democrats in Pittsburgh than elsewhere. That is all I can say about that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Democrats, of course, are very anxious to carry out the letter, spirit, and purposes of the civil-service law and regulations, to such an extent that a bill is now proposed putting all first-, second-, and third-class postmasters under civil service. Would the gentleman favor this bill?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I would favor that bill if it did not have a stinger attached. After you have appointed all Democrats to the post offices, you want to freeze them into the offices. [Laughter and applause.] I am in favor of putting the first-, second-, and third-class post offices under civil service if you will open up the field without fear or favor and let the best man be the postmaster. That is what we stand for.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How long would the gentleman want to wait before that is done?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Do it tomorrow. I would vote for such a bill tomorrow or even this afternoon if it were up.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I would really like to get on with my remarks. I have not said anything about your A B C agencies at all. I am talking now about the regular establishments and the debauch of the civil service in appointments to these establishments.

As I have said, the people in class A in the old Radio Commission were the legal staff and those retained specially in specific cases, one private secretary or confidential clerk to each member of the Commission, and one secretary to the Federal Radio Commission. The legal staff, a secretary for each Commissioner and a secretary for the Commission were the only ones who were not in the competitive class, but nevertheless, were generally under the Civil Service Commission's control in class A.

You passed the communications bill. The communications bill came from above. It was introduced and passed here without amendment by the House and—

Without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Commission may appoint and prescribe



the duties and fix the salaries of a secretary, a chief engineer, one or more assistants, a general counsel and one or more assistants, experts, inspectors, and special counsel; and each Commissioner may appoint and prescribe the duties of an assistant and a secretary at an annual salary not to exceed \$4,000.

This means that the experts, the examiners, and so forth, which means every employee of the Communications Commission, except the girls who play on typewriters and file papers as file clerks, are exempt from civil service and exempt from the regular schedules of salary in the permanent departments in this Commission, which heretofore had been 100 percent under civil service.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is not the fact, as a matter of experience. The Commission has interpreted that to mean only experts outside of the civil service. They took over practically all the old employees of the Radio Commission, and they have consistently refused to take anybody outside of civil service who was not an expert, either as a lawyer or an engineer. I am sorry. I have had experience with respect to the matter.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Perhaps the gentleman is in the same situation as my friend from Kentucky was in with respect to the janitor in his home-town post office. [Laughter]

Mr. O'CONNOR. We only have one post office in our city divided among 19 Congressmen. So we are not interested in postmasters or janitors.

Mr. LEHLBACH. By means of Executive orders, by means of various subterfuges, by consolidations, by transfer of functions, and so forth, raids on the permanent civil service in established permanent departments have been made, so that the number, for the first time in half a century, of civil service protected employees in the regular departments of the Government has decreased instead of increased.

Now, with respect to the new agencies created, every single employee was appointed without regard to the civil service or the Classification Act of 1923.

How are these appointments made? I have here before me the case of the C. C. C. camps where the forces were extended about a year ago. A man who had had experience in summer camps in training young men in physical culture, admirably qualified as a man to function in these camps, made application, like the simple fool he was, for such a position, and he got this reply:

Mr. ————,  
Peshine Avenue, Newark, N. J.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of April 22, as stated in my letter of April 8, this office is unable under binding Federal instructions to consider any nontechnical man for appointment to the supervisory work in the C. C. C. camps unless his name is certified to us on the so-called advisors list from Washington. This is a list of names submitted by Senator Moore and the Democratic Representatives in Congress from New Jersey to the Federal administration for employment in this C. C. C. activity. The only way in which you can put yourself in a position to secure such employment, therefore, is by making arrangements to have Senator Moore or one of the Democratic Congressmen request that your name be put on this advisors list.

Now, not only the C. C. C. camps but the old C. W. A., which met an untimely death, every other activity, every single man jack employed, over 200,000 of them, were appointed from lists furnished by State or local Democratic committees—every single one of them.

Mr. GIFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, I can supplement that. I tried to get an employee into the C. C. C. camp. They took pity on me and said, "We will have to tell you that you have five Democratic Congressmen and two Democratic Senators. The Senators have 50 percent of the appointments, and the Congressmen have 10 percent each, and it is useless to make any more recommendations."

Mr. LEHLBACH. Of course. I will tell you what happened in my district under the C. W. A., which was a reasonably decent precursor of the malodorous W. P. A. today.

Here was a man who was a good mechanic. He was out of work. He and his family lived in a two-family house. The landlord was a boxing promoter. He was an arranger for boxing matches, and whatever he made on that was his income. He had no income until he pulled off a boxing match,

and he made five or eight thousand dollars a year. He owned several houses which he rented out.

This man who was a good mechanic, a sober, industrious citizen, applied to the C. W. A. for a little work, because his savings had been exhausted and the landlord was threatening him with ejectment.

They could not find any place for him, but he found out, and it was the fact, that his landlord, because he had no boxing match in prospect and therefore was temporarily unemployed, was on the P. W. A. relief list, and spent his afternoons, after he had reported in the morning for alleged work, looking at moving picture shows and sleeping in dark moving picture houses so that he would not be seen on the street. With his pocket full of P. W. A. money, he served notice of eviction on this decent mechanic who was living in one of his houses and owed him rent, because he could not get relief from the P. W. A. That is the way the functioning of employment in relief agencies exists throughout the country at the present time in all these various agencies, because they are run to the limit from top to bottom by nothing but political appointees, whose duty it is to promote the success of the Democratic Party and insure, if possible, the reelection of Franklin D. Roosevelt next November.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I was especially interested this morning in an editorial in the Washington Post relative to a condition that confronts the Commerce Committee of the Senate in trying to prepare a proper emergency flood-relief bill. There is no doubt that the various Members of both Houses are very anxious to take care of their individual districts in respect to these matters, and it seems to be a propitious time, when we have a measure of this kind before us, to add as many projects as possible. I am not condemning any of these projects, but many of them are not primarily of the emergency kind and could well be considered at a later date. I have risen to make a short statement relative to the condition that confronts us in regard to this measure. The northeastern part of the United States as a whole, I think I might say, has never been flood conscious until the last couple of years. Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and New England have never been afflicted very often until lately, but during the last 9 months they have had two very serious flood conditions, and as a result the loss in the southern part of New York State and the northern part of Pennsylvania alone has reached from \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000. This part of the country has never asked before for any special relief of this nature. Considering the fact that the Federal Government during the last 20 or 25 years has spent probably \$350,000,000 to \$400,000,000 on flood control, and that these special States from Ohio east have probably contributed from 50 to 60 percent of that entire amount, and considering the fact that we are confronted with a special emergency situation at the present time, we feel that the committee in the Senate should be allowed to complete its bill along the lines intended, and that the bill should not be loaded up with so many projects that it will practically defeat the purposes of the bill. I am not saying anything against any one of these general flood-control projects, but I do feel they are not of the same emergency importance as some of those that have developed out of the recent disasters in the last year. For instance, two serious floods have occurred in the southern part of New York State and the northern part of Pennsylvania. It seems to me that we should have some relief now to take care of the situation before other floods come in the fall or in the coming spring. Industry in this section of the country where it has been so severely afflicted during the last year is beginning to get the jitters as to what is going to happen to it. I am willing to support all legitimate flood-control matters.

As a matter of fact, I think I introduced myself as comprehensive a flood-control bill as was ever introduced in the House, some 12 to 15 years ago, but it did not receive very



much attention at that time. That was a comprehensive system to hold the waters in the upper reaches of these rivers, and that, in my judgment, is the only way that you will ever get comprehensive flood control in the entire country. I expect every man to look after his particular section of the country as well as he can. None of the flood destruction is in my individual district, but I hope this bill will not be so loaded that it will take so long to get it through that we will not be able to meet, during the present summer, the emergency condition that exists in the eastern part of the United States, which never before has had any special relief from these flood-control appropriations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am in thorough accord with the wisdom of the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, but when he speaks of emergency relief from a situation developed by this late flood, is it not the gentleman's fear, as it is mine, that if these relief measures are attempted too precipitately and without proper study of the engineering, topographic, and soil-erosion features, a great amount of the money we spend will be ultimately wasted?

Mr. SNELL. I entirely agree with the gentleman, but as far as the southern part of New York State and the northern part of Pennsylvania are concerned, the Army Engineers and a board of engineers from the State of New York have made a comprehensive plan and are ready to recommend their plans and go ahead with the work. The only thing needed at the present time is assistance from the Federal Government. Even our State cannot take care of the condition that exists at the present time, and, considering what we have contributed to the flood relief in other parts of the country during all these years, I think we are entitled to this assistance, and to have it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is the gentleman's opinion, then, after a study of the situation, that there are phases of emergency relief that are already laid out and can be adequately made if the appropriations are made?

Mr. SNELL. I think that is a true statement, that there are. For instance, when we had the big Mississippi River flood several years ago, we did not try to tie that up with all of the other flood control in the United States. We took that up as a special project because it was special in itself, far-reaching, and must have early and immediate attention.

The only thing I want to bring before the House is that I hope it will be possible that the Commerce Committee of the Senate may be allowed to do what the committee itself wants to do, namely, keep this bill within reason and have it confined to the real emergency projects that must be attended to during the coming summer, and where the engineering has already been done under the supervision of the Board of Army Engineers, which is the best board we have in this country. Where those projects are ready and have been approved, we should get the money and go at it, and not load the bill down so that it will be killed of its own weight. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN].

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] was giving his recent very interesting speech, thoughts of Postmaster General New and the "Buck-eye buccaneer" Postmaster General Brown insisted upon fitting through my mind. I could not escape the wish that the Republican Party might have been half as virtuous in office as it is when out of control of the Government.

I do not always disagree, however, with my Republican colleagues. Occasionally one expresses a wish or hope that I am glad to agree with. That occurred on the 30th of last month when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREAD-

WAY] expressed the hope that the Republican convention would adopt an aggressive antireciprocity program.

If the gods that make men mad will just reserve a little activity for that convention and do two things, see that the convention nominates the gentleman from Kansas for President and see that that convention adopts an aggressive antireciprocity program, two-thirds of the battle to reelect President Roosevelt will already have been accomplished. By the time the radio, the press, and the public speakers get about half-way through this campaign, with the Governor from Kansas leading the Republican Party, and the people begin to see his utter bankruptcy of background and the complete absence of capacity for Presidential office, instead of the managers of the Republican Party keeping him west of Ohio, as they have at the present time, they will want to do something like they did in 1920, conduct a front-porch campaign, except in this case I believe it will be a back-porch campaign. By the time Mr. Hearst with his movie-tone and all the Hearst papers proceed with their futile build-up, our own children become fully acquainted with the facts in the coming campaign, they will come home to us some evening after reading the papers and say, "Father, during this campaign if Governor Landon should die, would Mr. Hearst still be candidate for President?"

I do not believe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], when he asserted the hope that reciprocity be made an issue in this campaign, realized the water that has gone over the wheel since the days of the old full dinner-pail campaign. People in this country, through the activity of the Tariff Commission, are no longer as uninformed as they were a few years ago. They know something about reciprocity and the tariff now. If the Tariff Commission has done nothing else than educate the people and inform the press of this country, it has done a wonderful thing.

Now, conceive the Republican Party setting out on an aggressive antireciprocity campaign with about two-thirds of their newspapers already committed against it, with the United States Chamber of Commerce, or at least its officials, very much committed in favor of reciprocity, there will not be enough left of the Republican campaign on the question of reciprocity even to be interesting.

The old days of tariff campaigns were very simple for the high-tariff advocates, for the reason that they could talk in pictures that were easily grasped by children, whereas people advocating reciprocity or a low tariff had to talk in abstract ideas. Their textbook was political economy and contained but few pictures.

As an example, the high-tariff advocates talked about the evils of imports. The imports were here, tangible, visible. Even a child's mind could conceive the idea that local labor could manufacture that import if given an opportunity. The reciprocity advocate would talk about the desirability of exports, but the exports were shipped abroad, out of sight, intangible, and it was a very difficult thing to convince anybody that there was anything to be gained by something that was out of the country. Even people who produced for export had no idea at the time they were doing so. If they did they could see no connection between importing Spanish grapes or Swiss cheese and the commodity they exported.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I will a little later.

Mr. GIFFORD. The other gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is not here.

Mr. HARLAN. But he was notified and he was here a short time ago. I am sorry, but I cannot yield at this time.

If reciprocity advocates, however, cannot draw pictures of their own they can look at and examine some of the pictures drawn by their opponents. One of their favorite artistic efforts is the favorable balance of trade. They tell us that under high tariff they have consistently been able to sell more goods than they have had to buy, and to the ordinary man who likes to sell a lot and buy little this looks like wonderful business. While we are looking at this picture, however, let us look at the countries that are grouped with us as having a favorable balance of trade. We find countries



like India, Cuba, Argentina, Brazil, and Germany. We note the absence of such countries as the United Kingdom, Japan, France, and Italy. We also note that in 1914, when Germany was at the height of her power as an industrial commercial empire, she had a tremendous unfavorable balance of trade and that now, as she is in bankruptcy, we find Germany having a favorable balance of trade. It would seem to me that even to a child's mind in an adult body, with a Republican high-tariff complex, there would seem to be something wrong with a picture in which the United States finds itself associated with India, Cuba, Brazil, Argentina, and bankrupt Germany and out of the company of the United Kingdom, Japan, France, prosperous Germany, and Italy. If it be true, as they say, that the tariff is responsible for this grouping, then certainly there is something wrong with the tariff somewhere.

The plain, cold facts on this subject which they ignore are that neither tariff nor reciprocity has very much to do with the balance of trade. Reciprocity produces an increase in quantity of trade, but the ratio between tangible imports and exports is not changed a great deal. It is changed slightly, but not a great deal by either tariff or reciprocity.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

Comparing the months of 1934 when we had no reciprocity with the months of 1935 when we did have reciprocity; comparing our exports for one year to those nations with which we had reciprocity with our exports to the same nations in the next year when we did not have reciprocity, we find our exports to those nations increased 31 percent, whereas the imports from those nations to the United States increased 148 percent.

Country and time	Exports, in thousands		Imports, in thousands	
	1934	1935	1934	1935
Sweden (August to December).....	\$15,619	\$18,139	\$16,312	\$21,824
Haiti (June to December).....	1,713	2,011	797	746
Belgium (May to December).....	31,435	41,154	17,727	28,370
Cuba (January to September).....	27,743	38,690	24,907	97,193
Total.....	76,510	99,994	59,743	148,133

This tremendous increase in imports was due to the fact that it happened the months we have to take for comparison cover the time during which Cuba sent a whole year's quota of sugar into the United States in a period of about 9 months; but since the figure is unfavorable to reciprocity we will let it stand. In the meantime, however, exports to the Smoot-Hawley tariff nations during the same year increased 5½ percent as against 31 percent to reciprocity countries. The imports from Smoot-Hawley nations increased 23 percent as against 148 percent from reciprocity countries; so the ratio of imports and exports of reciprocity countries is about the same as of Smoot-Hawley countries; but there is this great difference, the percentage of increase in 1935 over 1934 of all trade imports and exports is six times as great under reciprocity as it was under the Smoot-Hawley tariff. Now, these are some figures, Mr. Chairman, that cannot be laughed off. This percentage increase may not always continue to be this great. If the increase were only twice or three times we might say it was temporary, but an increase of six times as much trade with reciprocity countries as with high tariff countries must be accepted as meaning something. If you accept these figures you can oppose reciprocity on only one of two grounds: First, you will have to take the position that trade and commerce is not a desirable thing. If you do not want to take this position, if you are afraid to take this absurd position, then we in Congress to vote against reciprocity must say that we admit trade is a good thing but we are going to protect our local districts' industries and let the welfare of the rest of the country go hang. These two propositions you must admit if you realize that trade with reciprocity countries has increased six times over that of trade with nonreciprocity countries.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does the gentleman agree, then, that so far as the dairy industry is concerned they are being damaged but the gentleman would square the damage by saying it has helped some other part of the country?

Mr. HARLAN. There is no industry in the country that has been more definitely benefited by reciprocity than the dairy industry.

Mr. BOILEAU. How about the Canadian trade agreement on the importation of cheese?

Mr. HARLAN. I cannot yield further at this time, but I will yield later.

We are looking at pictures. Let us now look at the picture entitled "High Tariff Makes High Wages." The gentleman on the other side of the aisle draws a picture of happy factory employees coming out of the factory, opening pay envelopes, and looking over the wall marked "tariff" into the dilapidated hovels of foreign laborers. The rest of this picture, Mr. Chairman, which is not shown, depicts thousands of American factories that have been driven out of this country into Canada, into England, into Germany, and other countries, and now even into Mexico, employing foreign laborers where Americans ought to be employed. This picture ignores the fact that five-sixths of our laborers get no benefits at all from this wonderful high-tariff protection; it ignores the fact also that the average wage of those who are not working under protection has been 75 cents an hour as against 56 cents an hour, the average wage for those working in protected industries.

The average annual income from protected labor is something like \$1,104 and nonprotected labor \$1,709. If tariffs are responsible for this wage, as the tariff proponents say they are, then certainly there is something wrong in the way the tariff has treated American labor. (Wages: F. W. Taussig, *Some Aspects of the Tariff Question*.)

A few years ago a group of Ohio tire manufacturers came to Washington. I happened to be present at the meeting. This was just after one factory from Ohio had gone to England to manufacture tires. I was sitting next to an executive of this company and was certainly sure I had a low-tariff advocate next to me. I asked him what he thought of the Smoot-Hawley tariff. He said:

Fine; I am for it. I realize that we have had to take part of our production abroad, but we made just as much profit manufacturing there as here.

They had just as much interest in American labor that had been displaced by retaliatory tariffs as an ordinary man would have when there is talk of Army mules being displaced by tractors.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] insists that the Smoot-Hawley tariff created no resentment abroad. Apparently the fact that 45 nations, against all precedents, made a direct protest against the bill to our State Department means nothing to him. Latin American countries raised their rates on all our exports. Spain reduced the tariff on automobiles 60 percent to apply to every country except the United States. We had an annual trade in automobiles with Spain prior to the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 5,000 cars a year. After the change in the Spanish tariff this shrunk to almost nothing. We had almost a monopoly of the radio business in France because France manufactured no radios. After the Smoot-Hawley tariff our quota was reduced to 10 percent of their consumption and the rest went to Germany.

Oh, no; there were no retaliatory tariffs against us. They did not hate us. They just liked the other people better. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the purpose of all this reciprocity campaign talk is not in the interest of free trade. It is simply to try to return to the tariff schedules which we had prior to the Smoot-Hawley debacle. It is an effort to get us back on some kind of a friendly commercially profitable plane with the rest of the world. The same gentleman has repeatedly contended that the Smoot-Hawley tariff did not injure our foreign trade, because, he said:



Our imports of duty-free goods after the Smoot-Hawley tariff actually went down quicker than our imports of dutiable goods.

The fact of the matter is that our free goods then, as now, were all raw materials for manufacture or the basic foods. When the panic of 1929 hit us the first thing that stopped were the factories and their demand for raw material. The families that were thrown out of work could not buy food, and naturally it was raw materials and food that dropped first; while the people who could buy the more or less luxury commodities that came in under the duty list were still able to buy and the demand continued. The reverse happened on our return to prosperity. The increase has not been in the dutiable class. It has been in the low-duty and the free-import brackets.

While our opponents have been drawing pictures they have not neglected to dramatize. They like to dramatize themselves as the exclusive custodians of all true patriotism. Buy American! Keep your money at home! Employ American labor! Let the foreigner pay the tax!

Mr. Chairman, the poorly concealed purpose of all this is to endeavor to demonstrate that it is possible for this country to be happy and prosperous while our neighbors are in squalor and want.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I will a little bit later. I will put the gentleman's question anywhere he wants it put in the speech.

Mr. GIFFORD. That will be very nice. I have listened to the gentleman patiently.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has enjoyed his efforts to pillory Dr. Sayre and Dr. Grady, of the State Department, who advocate the opening of our foreign trade. Dr. Grady and Dr. Sayre have said that our highest prosperity can come only when other people are sufficiently prosperous to prefer to live in peace as opposed to war and to make good customers. This, the gentleman says, is dangerous internationalism.

In the words of the "Unhappy Walker", let us look at the record. From 1915 to 1920 we had a wonderful period of prosperity in this country. We Democrats who were then in power thought that a part of this was due to our reorganization of the banking system and to the assistance lent to agriculture and to a reasonable degree of honesty in government. But not so, say the Republicans. The prosperity was due to foreign conditions and an unusual foreign demand for our goods, they say. Then in 1929 we had a depression which soon developed into the greatest panic in our history. We Democrats recognized the apparent necessity of the depression, but thought the panic was due to the fact that the banking system under Republican administration had become rotten; that the Government was either dishonest or very much uninspired; that industry had become strangled by its own parasites; and a peasant population had developed in agriculture. The Republicans then said, "Oh, no; you are all wrong. That panic," so they said, "was due to world conditions. The foreigners could not buy our commodities and could not pay their debts; therefore we had the panic."

Thus it seems that both Democratic prosperity and Republican panics are due to world conditions; but do not let a member of the Democratic State Department say anything about improving these world conditions by opening up trade because if they do they are dangerous internationalists and the red flag of Moscow is going to supplant the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Does the gentleman know it has been claimed that the Smoot-Hawley tariff cost the people of Michigan about \$63 apiece? Also, the New York Post stated, "What would you think of a merchant who prepared for hard times by deliberately insulting his best customer?" That is what we did under the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

Mr. HARLAN. I yield now to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. At the beginning of the gentleman's remarks he said that the race for the reelection of Roosevelt

was two-thirds over if the Republicans took certain things as their slogan to which the gentleman referred. Did the gentleman hear of this little conversation between Owen D. Young and the President, in which he stated he lost 7 votes in a particular New York county? There are no Democrats involved in the northern part of the country where this thing occurred.

Mr. HARLAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 17 we find some further remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts on the question of reciprocity which might be called highly uninteresting even if true.

We notice a table with columns designated "Net exports", "Silver bought", "Gold bought", and "Total."

For the year 1929 we find under "net exports", \$841,000,000. Everyone knows that our exports for that year were \$5,200,000,000, so he must have meant by "net exports" that great blessing, the favorable balance of trade. In his last column called "total" he has a figure of \$740,000,000. This result is achieved by adding to net exports the silver bought, nineteen millions, and subtracting the gold bought of one hundred and twenty millions.

Elementary arithmetic suggests that whenever we subtract a quantity we call the result a remainder, but whether we call it a total or a remainder, it would certainly be helpful if someone would tell us what, if anything, it means. Certainly the gentleman from Massachusetts left us wholly in the dark.

To get his "total" for 1930 he adds the silver and subtracts the gold.

For 1931 he subtracts the silver and adds the gold.

For 1934 he subtracts both gold and silver and produces a "total" which would be highly interesting if it meant anything.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield the gentleman from Ohio 3 additional minutes so that I may make a brief comment and ask the gentleman a question, with his permission?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LAMBETH. I have listened to the gentleman's remarks with a great deal of interest, and in order to keep history straight I think it should be stated that the first reciprocal-trade agreement ever negotiated with Canada was by a Republican President, Mr. Taft, in 1911.

I have had occasion recently to read the debates in the Canadian House of Commons upon this subject, and it is interesting to note the arguments of the opposition party, which was so overwhelmingly defeated last fall and which is now against ratification of the agreement by Canada. The argument used against ratification has been that the agreement would create more unemployment in Canada; in other words, that the agreement is bad for Canada, just as our friends across the aisle say it is bad for the United States. One or the other of them must be wrong. However, the preliminary vote on approval in the Canadian House of Commons on March 10 carried by a vote of 175 to 39, so I am inclined to think that if this question becomes the chief issue of the Republican Party this fall the vote will be equally decisive against their position. It is also interesting to note that in the course of the argument of the former Prime Minister, Mr. Bennett, who is leading the opposition, the member from Moose Jaw commented upon his remarks and called them "pap." I am inclined to think that the arguments against the agreement in this country are more political and sectional than economic and national, and that they are more partisan than political.

I thank the gentleman for permitting me to inject these remarks into his speech.

Mr. HARLAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. With respect to the advocates of high-tariff privilege, oh, far be it from them to talk about dividends or profits. They are not the things they are interested in. They are always interested in the poor laboring man. Canada is no different in the matter of organized greed than the United States.



I wish I had some time to go into some phases of the Canadian parliamentary argument.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HARLAN. The remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] on this question are so obviously the production of that great master mind, George N. Peek, because they are just a repetition of the things he puts out, and that gentleman is here now doing ghost writing for anyone who wants to make a speech on the subject.

That gentleman made a remarkable discovery. Sometime ago he found out that a foreign individual who possessed credit in this country could use that credit to buy American investments. That seemed terrible to him, so he comes out with an entirely new system of international trade, described in some papers as "Peekonomy." It is marvelous that he waited until 1935 to give that discovery to the world, when we had so many examples in the 1920's. During that time America did not want to take European imports, so it used its credit to make extensive investments in Europe. They turned out to be gifts rather than investments, because they were no good.

All such investments are either good or bad. If good, some day they will have to be paid back, and when paid back they will have the same effect on trade as if the goods were purchased in the first place. While investments are in operation dividends have to be paid and are a stimulation to the export business.

Now, in the long run, we might just as well try to escape the law of gravity as the fact that in the final analysis tangible plus intangible exports, plus gifts received, equal tangible and intangible imports, plus gifts sent.

If we reduce imports we reduce exports to the same extent, and we can no more escape this result than we can escape taxes.

Now, the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] show considerable evidence of "Peekonomy", when he told us on March 20 as follows:

I call the attention of the House to what reciprocal trade agreements are doing to the farmers of this country. In 1933 there were imported into the country 4 times as much wheat as was imported in 1934, 14 times as much corn, twice as much oats, 22 times as much butter, 75 times as much beef, and 30 times more pork, double the amount of wool, and the same holds true of a great many other farm commodities.

Now, not a single item named was affected in any way by the reciprocal treaties, except just about enough corn imported from Cuba to supply the moonshine liquor for one county in Pennsylvania.

As long as high-tariff advocates continue to put such false and misleading propaganda into our records, certainly somewhere, some place, it shows something wrong with the whole tariff argument. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] repeated the same thing on the 30th. It has been put into the RECORD time and time again. This increase in imports, or certainly so far as eleven-twelfths of it is concerned, has nothing whatever to do with the reciprocity treaty. Eleven-twelfths of our increase in imports come in under the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

In conclusion, I want all to remember, in spite of the artistry and dramatics, and so forth, that the reciprocity program is not one of free trade. Jumping out of the frying pan into the fire has never been a pleasurable or profitable occupation. Tariffs regiment industry, exploit labor, and impoverish agriculture, but a nation that has built its economy on tariffs is like a man afflicted with the drug habit. If you destroy the evil at one blow you will probably kill your patient. Drastic reductions in tariffs would promote foreign dumping and destroy investment, disorganize industry, and promote unemployment. No one is recommending that. What this administration, with reciprocity treaties, is trying to do is to return to the prepanic tariff rates of 1922, and thus start the world again back toward an era of economic peace and good neighborliness.

Reciprocity is one phase of that persistent idea—the Golden Rule. Reciprocity points the way to peace in com-

mercial warfare, to a truce in military conflicts. Reciprocity is based upon the concept that each of us prospers best when we all prosper most.

Just prior to the recent naval conference, Japanese spokesmen indicated strongly that no naval reduction was possible as long as tariff walls closed up raw material markets. Representatives of Germany have recently made the same statement with reference to peace in Europe so long as Germany is deprived of her colonies and access to raw materials.

Mussolini has openly said that Kellogg treaties, Locarno pacts, and peace treaties generally are of little value as compared to a reduction in tariffs.

Dr. Hendrick van Loon in his Story of the World We Live In, while speaking of the World War, said:

It is a bit sad to reflect that pigs were primarily responsible for the outbreak of that terrible disaster. For Serbia had only one great article of export—pigs—and by putting impossible duties on pigs, the Austrians and Hungarians were able to ruin the only trade from which Serbia derived any profit at all. The dead Austrian grand duke was the pretext for the mobilization of all the armed forces of Europe. But the underlying cause of all the ill-feeling in the northeastern corner of the Balkans was the duty on pigs.

The difference between our former tariff treatment of Cuba and the Austro-Hungarian conduct toward Serbia lies in the fact that Cuba had no allies powerful enough to declare war on us.

It would be humorous if it were not so serious, to listen to our colleague from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], who is so ardent for peace that he voted against the World War, and yet constantly expounds the virtues of a high tariff, the one underlying cause driving this world into another inevitable holocaust.

Our colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] eloquently and constantly expounds the cause of peace yet he has been most ardent in his advocacy of commercial warfare. In fact, he has signed a petition on the Speaker's desk that would carry high tariff to its logical conclusion and establish a complete trade embargo as far as dairy products is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot starve our neighbors and expect to live in peace, we cannot continue as the custodian of the world's greatest raw-material market and hope to preserve our neutrality in any kind of a world conflict. There is just one way out, dictated by common sense, by our experience, and by our desire for profits, and that is to open up channels to foreign trade. Until this is done the hope of any permanent peace is simply a delusion.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I always feel quite melancholy after listening to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN], and I feel a spiritual impulse to say amen. Also I feel like the young gentleman in the song that was current during the war, expressing the sentiment that "they are all out of step but Jim." Perhaps we are out of step, perhaps I am out of step, but you know there must also be a lot of people in the Corn Belt who are out of step, because on the 14th of April they are to have a huge conference at Sioux City, Iowa, in which they plan a fight on the farm imports. This invitation I hold in my hand says "The time has arrived for action against agricultural imports", and continues:

Come to this conference. The very life of the Middle West is at stake. The figures on imports of farm products given elsewhere on this page reveal the menacing situation that confronts the farmers directly and business and industry indirectly. Come to the big conference in Sioux City, Iowa, April 14, and help fight for justice for the Middle West. Your support is needed.

I am extending an invitation to my good friend from Ohio to go to the conference and be enlightened.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HARLAN. During the Republican administrations the price of farm products in the country was not high enough to encourage imports. Which would the farmers



rather have—farm products and no imports or higher prices and some imports?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This conference is being called in the heart of the Corn Belt, and there must either be a lot of deluded farmers and deluded Republicans, including myself, or else there is some basis for alarm in the fact that 1935 is the first time in our history that we have imported 43,000,000 bushels of corn, hundreds of millions of pounds of meat, millions of bushels of oats, wheat, and barley, and vast quantities of other farm products. What our Midwest farmers remember, but what my friend from Ohio forgets, is that these continued imports will soon break the price of farm products.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced a bill to make it a felony for a Member of Congress to participate in Federal patronage. The bill would prohibit Senators or Representatives from even writing letters urging appointment to or promotion in the Federal service, either civil service or noncivil service. The purpose of the bill is to aid in carrying out a program of divorcing legislation from patronage. The greatest threat to freedom in the United States is not communism, but the spoils system of patronage.

Our system of government never intended that legislators should be patronage dispensers. The control over legislation by the Chief Executive through influencing Members of Congress by doling out jobs for Congressmen and Senators to distribute in return for faithful subservience to Executive desires in legislative matters is a complete reversal and major violation of the spirit of our whole governmental philosophy.

The heart of the American system as established by the framers of the Constitution was complete separation and independence of the executive and legislative branches of government.

Through the development of the unsavory spoils system the Congress has been constantly losing its independence and legislative freedom. No longer are Congressmen and Senators responsive to the best interests of their constituents first, but now are first concerned with building up political machines through handing out jobs. No longer do Members of Congress depend for reelection upon their legislative records, but now count upon political appointees to do the job both for campaign contributions and the active campaign work.

It creates an unfair opportunity for incumbents to perpetuate themselves in office. The most successful Congressmen are the ones who obtain the most jobs for constituents, not the ones who contribute the most constructive legislative solutions of our national problems.

The patronage system makes for inefficient, incompetent Government operation of the various departments and bureaus.

The loyalty of a political appointee is naturally to his or her patron who was instrumental in obtaining the appointment. How can it be otherwise? The result is that the merit system plays very little part in our Federal service. It is grossly unfair to the bulk of citizens who aspire to Federal service. Of course, only a comparative few of such people happen to know a Congressman or Senator. Yet those few form a favored class in America, to the exclusion of the great bulk of applicants who do not have congressional pull. This is so even in the civil service, where congressional influence is so often sought and too often given to appoint from the eligible list the political favorites. It has made a mockery of the civil service; and what is left of merit in the system dissipates into thin air because of the constant pressure of those who are so appointed to use the same political pressure to obtain promotions after they get on the Federal pay roll and usually not long after, either. This inevitably discourages those who do get appointed solely as a result of competitive examination and who depend for promotion

solely upon the value of the service rendered to the Government.

Unfortunately, the loyalty of politically appointed employees of the Government is too much to individuals and the political party responsible for their jobs and not to the Government itself. Too often the main service rendered is to the political machine or the individual patron and not to the work of the bureau or department of the Government for which and by whom the appointee is paid.

The general impression seems to be that a Member of Congress is or should be a free employment agency and that finding of jobs on the Federal pay roll for a favored few constituents is the main purpose for which he is elected.

To free Congress from administration control so that legislation may become the true expression of the will of the people, to improve legislation by restricting Congressmen to their legislative duties, and to improve Government service in the interests of increased efficiency and economy, it is absolutely essential that the merit system of appointment to and advancement within Government employment be extended from top to bottom.

Only selected and a comparatively few policy-making officers should be exempted from a great public-service system, protected from the spoilsman and dependent solely upon the individual's merit, with equal opportunity for all. This bill is an effort to further such a movement.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have obtained this time to make a little clearer my question to the gentleman from Ohio. When I read the paragraph a day or two ago it was clear that the President tried to tell Mr. Young that he had but little chance on the reciprocity matters in Canada, because there were so few Democrats along the Canadian border who would be adversely affected, that not many votes would be affected either way.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have long been an admirer of the Constitution of the United States which beyond any doubt is the greatest statement of fundamental governmental facts that the world has ever known. In my judgment, one of the crowning features of the Constitution is the Supreme Court of the United States. Under our constitutional theory our Government is divided into the legislative, executive, and judicial departments, each supreme within its own field, yet cooperating to make a perfected government.

Much discussion has occurred on the floor of the House with reference to the right of the Supreme Court to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional. There are those upon the floor that look upon this prerogative of the Supreme Court as purely one of usurpation, never contemplated by the fathers of the Constitution, and not provided by the Constitution itself.

On the other hand, there are others who believe it is clearly the right of the Supreme Court to pass upon the constitutionality of laws, whether State or National.

Under the theory that we have three independent forms of government, clearly the Supreme Court would be assumed then to have this constitutional right. It is very interesting to turn back the pages of history and glean what information we can there with reference to our concept of the Supreme Court. On the floor of the House it has been repeatedly said that inasmuch as we derived our legal procedure from England, and the English courts claim no power to review acts of Parliament, therefore it was unprecedented for the Federal courts to review acts of Congress. This statement is worth considering.

It is true that the English courts prior to 1787, at which time our National Constitutional Convention was in session, recognized the absolute supremacy of an act of Parliament. That recognition, however, was not based on a conception of legislative immunity from judicial review but was based on the fact that Parliament itself acted in a dual capacity—as both legislature and court. Parliament was a court before it ever assumed legislative powers, and it was and



always has been from its inception the highest court of England. An act of Parliament was both supremely legislative and supremely judicial.

Viscount Brice, one of England's greatest constitutional writers and the author of *The American Commonwealth*, said:

Parliament is not a body with delegated or limited authority. The whole fullness of power dwells in it. The whole nation is supposed to be present within its walls. Magna Carta and the other bulwarks of English liberty restrain only the kingly power. Parliament itself is subject to no constitutional restrictions. Parliament is omnipotent.

The Constitution, however, is entirely different in America. Congress has no judicial powers with a possible exception of impeachment and with relation to its Members, and even the legislative powers are enumerated and limited by the Constitution itself. Therefore there is no ground whatever for judges to rank an act of Congress as they would an act of Parliament.

Most of the authorities who have controverted the judicial right to review congressional legislation have based their arguments largely on the common-law esteem of acts of Parliament. Each of these authorities, however, overlooked the fundamental difference between Parliament and Congress; each overlooked the designation of Parliament in the Declaration of Independence as "a jurisdiction unacknowledged by our laws"; each overlooked the patent fact that the common law is not a part of the supreme law of the land as defined by the Constitution; and each overlooked the historical fact that the American idea of judicial review is not an offshoot of the common law but is a development of colonial practice.

Among the arguments heard on the floor of the House with reference to the Supreme Court's alleged usurpation of power in assuming the right to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional is the statement that the fathers of our Constitution did not recognize the right of any judicial body to declare a legislative act unconstitutional. Let us again study the historic background of this statement. The colonial governments in America were the issues of specific grants from the King and were thus "connected to England through the Crown and not through Parliament or any other governmental division of the Kingdom." These grants authorized the establishment of a limited form of self-government and were usually called charters, although the ones established in New Hampshire, New Jersey, and North Carolina were styled constitutions. These charters differed considerably in the specific powers granted or conveyed to the respective Colonies, but they had this common provision, that local legislation should not be contrary to the laws of England. This provision itself was adopted from the constitution of the Island of Jersey and has been applied to most of the colonial charters and constitutions granted to the early American Colonies.

In pursuance with that practice, the colonial laws were constantly decided by their charters and by the laws of England. If the laws of the charters were in conflict with the laws of England, then they were void. The extent of that practice is shown by the fact that nearly 400 acts of colonial assemblies were annulled by the Privy Council because they did not pass that test. The invalidation of a colonial act was read at least once in every court, once in every church, and once at the military muster throughout the colony. Thus the colonists became familiar with the practice of having their legislative acts declared unconstitutional when any of these acts conflicted with the parent body of laws. The local legislatures were limited by the terms of their grant or their charter; if a power had not been granted to them, it could not be exercised legally.

In pursuance with this principle established during the colonial period, the right of the courts to test legislation under the State constitution was quickly asserted in 8 of the 13 new States and became a settled American provision. Quoting from the Notes of James Madison, who was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, the statement was made:

In some States the judges had actually set aside laws as being against the Constitution. This was done with general approbation.

So instead of judicial power to determine the validity of legislation under a written constitution being unknown in 1787, it had been exercised in America under colonial and State governments for a hundred years prior to the Convention. Luther Martin, one of the members of the Constitutional Convention, said:

The constitutionality of laws will come before the judges in their official character. In this character they have a negative on the laws.

The right of judicial review was repeatedly declared in early sessions of Congress without any concerted opposition.

It has been asserted on the floor that the right of the Supreme Court to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional was originated by Chief Justice Marshall in the decision in the case of *Marbury against Madison*. As a matter of fact, we have seen historically that this principle had been established in America practically a hundred years prior to the enunciation of the principle established by Chief Justice Marshall in that case.

Again it is stated on the floor that there is nothing in the Federal Constitution to authorize the assumption that the courts should have a right to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional. When our forefathers were building the Constitution they were insistent on perfecting a government different from the parliamentary government of England and wanted to achieve the absolute independence of the judiciary.

Congress being an artificial creation of the Constitution, can exercise only such powers as the Constitution confers. Article I, section 1, brings Congress into being with the statement—

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

All legislative powers are not vested in Congress, but only such powers as are therein granted. Thus congressional legislative powers are special and limited. This limitation was deliberately made. The specific powers granted Congress are named in section 8 of article I, and include the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" the powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States. There is not even a hint that Congress can exercise any judicial power, with the exception, as above stated, to its relation to its own members and to impeachment. Section 8 fixes the absolute boundary of congressional action in relation to laws.

Judicial exposition of laws is beyond that boundary, and therefore beyond the range of Congress. After conferring on Congress the right to determine its own membership and on the Senate "the sole power to try all impeachments", the Constitution vests "the judicial power" of the United States in the Federal court. That phrase—"the judicial power"—must mean all the remaining judicial power, especially since there is no further planning whatever of judicial and legislative powers and no further delegation of any judicial power.

What is judicial power? It is the power to declare the law. What are the laws of the United States? They are the Constitution, the laws passed by Congress in pursuance of the Constitution, and all treaties made under the authority of the United States. Thus the Constitution does have a statement authorizing the Federal courts to declare the law in any case of law or equity arising under the laws of Congress. Every case before this court is either in law or equity. A line conferring more absolute jurisdiction in cases which involve acts of Congress cannot be conceived. For the power to declare the law necessarily comprises the right of determining what is the law and of rejecting what is not the law. Article VI further makes these three classes of laws "the supreme law of the land." An act of Congress "made in pursuance" of the Constitution thereby becomes the lawful equal of the Constitution itself, but an act repugnant to the Constitution is not made "in pursuance thereof", is not "proper for carrying into execution" the powers vested thereby in the Government of the United States as provided in article I, section 8, and is not the legal offspring of constitutional government.



In a case where the court must declare whether the Constitution or an unconstitutional act is the law, it would clearly be the duty of the court, under the general conception of official duty, to prefer the Constitution as paramount. This duty is made absolute by the judicial oath prescribed by the Constitution itself which binds the judges "to support the Constitution." The oath to support the Constitution has no exception. It permits no evasions. It requires exposition of every such violation whereon the court is required to declare the law.

From the above statements it follows historically and constitutionally that the Supreme Court have the clear and constitutional right to declare an act of Congress repugnant to the Constitution as unconstitutional.

I am much indebted to the Honorable John H. Hatcher, of West Virginia, in his recent forceful and pertinent address on the right of the Supreme Court to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional for much of the historic data herein given.

There is much discussion today with reference to the Supreme Court's attitude on labor, and the statement is frequently made that the Supreme Court decisions have been hostile, in the main, to organized labor. A study of the facts, however, determines that this statement is not true.

Charles Warren, a prominent Democrat, who formerly held the position of Assistant Attorney General under President Wilson, and who is known as the foremost historian in the country on the activities of the Supreme Court, has published a very notable book called "Congress, the Constitution, and the Supreme Court", in which book he reveals the fact that organized labor has received many more favorable decisions than otherwise. Mr. Warren states in his book that on laws of Congress the score has been 80 to 6 in favor of labor, and that in the case of State labor laws the Supreme Court has upheld 60 and decided adversely in only 6 cases.

Mr. Warren further states in his book—

In view of the record of steady support of legislation in behalf of and protection of labor, and rendered generally in cases in which the corporations and employers contend that the statutes were invalid, it may fairly be said that it is not only uncandid and unfair to the public, but also ridiculous for anyone to state that the decisions of the Court are on the side of the wealthy and powerful and against the poor and weak.

Mr. Warren's book is worthy careful study as a splendid presentation of the principles of Congress, the Constitution, and the Supreme Court. [Applause.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, so much has been said during the last few months about the refinancing of farm mortgages that I think the House will be interested to know just what has been done during the last 2½ years in connection with that situation. I present these facts as purely historical and without reference to the merits or otherwise of pending measures. When a fine piece of work is done in a successful way, it frequently attracts but little attention.

#### THE FARM-CREDIT SYSTEM

When I was a boy the farmers of north Texas lived under the shadow of 10 to 20 percent interest. When a farmer needed credit he would go to the local bank and make a 60- or 90-day note, bearing interest at the rate of 10 percent, with interest taken out in advance. As the farmer had to be financed on an annual basis, this interest would be compounded every 60 or 90 days, with rates figured as only a good banker could figure them.

I asked my father why this method was used. He told me that our banking system was fashioned to suit the needs of the commercial and business interests of the country and was not suited to the needs of the farm and ranch.

When I made my first race for Congress I had as a plank in my platform that an agricultural credit system should be fashioned suited to the needs of agriculture and separate and apart from the commercial credit structure of the country.

#### A SEPARATE CREDIT STRUCTURE

It was my privilege a little less than 3 years ago to sponsor the measure which established the Farm Credit Administra-

tion. So far as I have been able to learn, this is the first time in the history of any country that a complete credit system has been formed for agriculture, wholly independent of the commercial banking system. It should be interesting to everyone to have a report as to how this Administration has functioned and in a general way what it has accomplished.

#### A SUCCESSFUL ORGANIZATION

A fine piece of machinery runs smoothly and almost noiselessly. Sheerly on the basis of its operations and on the results achieved, it is, in my judgment, one of the most successful agencies established in the present administration. The naked facts prove this beyond dispute.

#### PURPOSES

At the time of its organization the Farm Credit Administration faced two major tasks:

First. The refinancing of hundreds of thousands of farmers' debts in as short a time as possible; and

Second. The building of a permanent system of credit for agriculture.

#### TYPES OF CREDIT

In building the Farm Credit Administration it was the purpose to make available through permanent institutions four different types of credit. To do this, four wings were established under one head, each wing to handle a different type of needed credit:

First. The land banks, to handle long-term land paper;

Second. The cooperative banks, to handle the necessary credit for farmers' cooperative buying and selling organizations;

Third. The production credit corporations, to handle the current essential production credit; and

Fourth. The intermediate credit banks, which are the discount institutions and which, through the sale of debentures, provide the necessary funds for the operations of the cooperative and production credit divisions.

Thus, instead of a heterogeneous lot of agencies of the Government supervising the making of loans to farmers, the administrative responsibility has been centered in one organization, the Farm Credit Administration, which under one head supervises the credit needs of the farm and ranch.

#### EMERGENCY REFINANCING

The biggest single job of the Farm Credit Administration was the refinancing of farm-mortgage indebtedness. Prior to its establishment, credit conditions in agriculture were nothing short of chaotic. The institutions which had normally furnished mortgage credit had virtually retired from the field. Not only had they ceased to lend, but many of them—almost in a state of panic—were trying to collect installments and liquidate holdings under conditions which made such collections virtually impossible. Threats of foreclosure and actual foreclosure suits were the order of the day. Hundreds of thousands of farmers were threatened with the loss of their homes. A major agricultural catastrophe was imminent; yet most of these farmers were in financial straits because of conditions beyond their control.

#### LAND BANK AND COMMISSIONER LOANS

Land bank and commissioner loans were made available up to a maximum of 75 percent of the appraised normal value of farms, with a maximum limitation of \$7,500 on individual loans. Between May 1, 1933, and January 31, 1936, 1,079,944 applications were filed. A total of 775,672 applications, or 71.8 percent of the total number received, had been approved prior to January 31, 1936. Applications numbering 35,028 were canceled or withdrawn, and 12,348 were in progress through the banks, but had not reached the loan committee. A number of applications which were approved were later canceled or withdrawn, principally because the applicant could not obtain the cooperation of his creditors in working out his debt problem, or because he had worked out his debt situation without the necessity of refinancing.

During this period 734,141 loans were closed for a total of \$1,962,514,301. It is estimated that nearly 87 percent of the total amount loaned by the land banks during the emergency period has been used to refinance indebtedness. Nearly 70 percent was used to pay off mortgage debts, 14 percent for



short-term debts, and about 3 percent for taxes. Thus these lending activities have not resulted in farmers going further into debt.

I make this flat statement, that the Farm Credit Administration, during the 2½ years has made more loans in refinancing farm mortgages than were made in the 16 previous years of the land bank's history. Statistics will show that. They have saved hundreds of thousands of farm homes. They have furnished the lowest rate of interest in doing so that has ever been furnished in the history of the world in any great country. [Applause.] Regardless of how people may feel and what they think interest rates should be, the fact is that we now have the lowest rates that any country ever had on long-term farm credit.

Here is an interesting thing in proving the effective way in which the farm credit has been handled. At the time this refinancing began, farm bonds were selling in the 80's. We have now the lowest rate of interest that we have ever had, and all farm-credit bonds are selling above par. We have a separate system of credit for agriculture. It may not be the best in the world but it certainly has produced results.

I want to cite you another interesting fact, in view of statements that have been made by people who sometimes get over-enthusiastic. I have a table here which shows the number of units that it has taken during the different years since 1920 to pay the interest on a \$10,000 mortgage, and the amount that it requires today. These are statistics that have been compiled in the Department of Commerce and in the Department of Agriculture.

Let us take cotton, for instance. In 1932, cotton was selling at 5 cents a pound. It took 25 bales of cotton to pay the interest on a \$10,000 loan. In 1935, cotton was selling at 11.9 cents per pound, and it took 5.9 bales of cotton, about one-fourth as many to pay the interest on a \$10,000 mortgage as it took in 1932. Is that unsuccessful administration?

I will insert in the Record a table which shows the rates from 1910 on.

In 1932 the farm price of wheat was 35.6 cents per bushel, and it took 1,826 bushels of wheat to pay the interest on a \$10,000 loan. In 1935 the farm price of wheat was 76.4 cents per bushel, and it took 458 bushels instead of 1,826 bushels to make the interest payment on a \$10,000 loan.

In 1932 the farm price of corn was 29.9 cents a bushel. In 1935 it was 82 cents a bushel. In 1932 it took 2,174 bushels of corn to pay the interest on a \$10,000 mortgage. In 1935 it took 425 bushels of corn instead of 2,174, about one-fourth as many.

The price of hogs in 1932 was \$4.23 per 100 pounds. In 1935 it was \$8.40 per 100 pounds. If a man wanted to sell hogs and pay his interest on a \$10,000 mortgage in 1932 he had to sell 70 hogs. Last year he had to sell only 19 hogs.

If a farmer were in the dairy business, the price of butter-fat in 1932 was 14.4 cents per pound. In 1935 it was 22 cents per pound. A man would have to sell 4,514 pounds of butter in 1932 and only 1,500 pounds in 1935 to pay the interest on a \$10,000 mortgage.

Taking the average of all farm products, the index price in 1932 was 57. The index price in 1935 was nearer to 100. The index of all farm products required to pay the interest on a \$10,000 mortgage in 1932 was 175. In 1935 it was 53.

Now, whatever else may be said, regardless of the fact that you may want a better system, regardless of the fact that you may think the interest rates should be lower, the fact remains that a magnificent job of refinancing farm mortgages has been done. Nobody can gainsay that fact.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. MAPES. I am not sure the gentleman can answer this question, but he spoke of the number of farms that have been saved by reason of the refinancing of farm mortgages in the last 3 years. Of course, there were a great many that were on the verge of being lost. In the gentleman's opinion, what percentage of the farm mortgages of those who were in danger of losing their farms has already been refinanced, and how many farmers are there now left

who are in danger of losing their farms because of over-indebtedness?

Mr. JONES. Of the 6,700,000 farms which it is estimated there are, there are mortgages on only 2,400,000. A little less than 40 percent of the farms of America are under mortgages at all. There are \$8,279,000,000 estimated now in outstanding farm mortgages of all kinds. On February 29, 1936, the land banks and land-bank commissioners had outstanding 1,078,160 loans, totaling slightly less than \$3,000,000,000.

Mr. MAPES. So that over one-third have been refinanced and are now held by the Government?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. I thought the total amount of farm mortgages was now something under eight billion.

Mr. JONES. It is about eight billion two hundred and seventy-nine million, according to the figures I have. These, however, include short-term obligations. If only long-term mortgages are included, it would be somewhat less than eight billion.

Mr. MAPES. Of course, the remaining farms that are mortgaged are not all mortgaged at anywhere near their full value?

Mr. JONES. That is true in many instances. Of course, some of them are. Some of them are mortgaged for more than their value.

In many instances where they are mortgaged for more than their value, unless the creditor will reduce the mortgage it is almost hopeless to try to refinance them. If the mortgage cannot be cut down to the place where the mortgagor has a chance to see daylight there is not much advantage in its being refinanced.

The rate of foreclosure is far less this year, and there are fewer abandonments, or cases in which the situation appears more or less hopeless. There are some exceptions, of course.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman's figures show what percentage of those who have obtained loans from the Government are failing to keep up their payments?

Mr. JONES. Yes. The payments have been kept up to a remarkable degree. The number of land-bank loans have more than doubled since the new administration was started, yet the number of delinquencies are actually less than when there were only half the number of outstanding loans. Up to date delinquencies have been much less than one would think. There are some, of course, mostly in connection with commissioners' loans and land-bank loans due to conditions prevailing.

#### DEBT REDUCTIONS

Applications for loans frequently indicated that the farmers' debts were so heavy they could not be refinanced without creditors agreeing to scale down the debts to a point where they could be refinanced with reasonable hope of final repayment. To assist in this situation, the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration early contacted the State Governors, suggesting the formation of agricultural advisory councils. These State councils, or committees, would recommend appointment of county debt-adjustment committees in each county, which in turn would work with deserving farmers and their creditors to reach a mutually satisfactory settlement of their debts.

Advisory councils were set up in 44 States and debt-adjustment committees in 2,752 counties. As a direct and indirect result of their work, many farm homes have been saved, thus keeping more than one-half million worthy persons on farms and off relief rolls. It is estimated that about 14 percent of the loans made by the land banks and 26 percent of the loans made by the Commissioner were made after scale-downs had been effected by the borrowers. The total amount of such scale-downs is approximately \$210,000,000.

Far outweighing these accomplishments, however, has been the influence of these committees in restoring credit stability in many troubled areas; in developing a debt-paying morale limited only by the debtor's ability to pay; and in promoting the development of a more general practice on the part of creditors to make the necessary voluntary adjust-



ments in order to avert liquidation. Yes, the Farm Credit Act has done more. It is the keystone in the supporting arch and has helped to save the credit structure of America.

The program has saved hundreds of thousands of farm homes.

#### INTEREST RATES REDUCED

The help extended during this emergency period has not been confined merely to refinancing farmers' indebtedness and relieving them from the threat of foreclosures. Easier terms and interest rates lower than ever before granted to the farm and ranch have been placed in effect. Emergency rates on all loans through associations are reduced to 3½ percent for all interest payable prior to July 1, 1936, and to 4 percent during the next succeeding 2 years.

#### SUCCESSFUL OPERATION

Refinancing of farm-mortgage debts on such a tremendous scale could not have been accomplished without bringing about the desired results. That the emergency job is passed, that abnormal numbers of foreclosures are also well behind us is shown by the steady decline in the applications for loans received by the 12 Federal land banks. During August 1933 applications for loans numbered about 76,000. During the same month in 1934 they totaled about 27,000, whereas in January of this year they were only about 7,800. Still another indication of improved conditions in agriculture and the nearing of the completion of the emergency activities in the farm-mortgage field is the heavy decline in requests for immediate aid to avoid impending foreclosure. Shortly after the Farm Credit Administration was organized an average of more than 500 applications per day for immediate help was received from farmers who were threatened with foreclosures. Now the number does not exceed 20 to 25 per day.

#### OTHER IMPROVEMENTS

Another favorable indication of better conditions in agriculture is improvement in loan payments. The records of the Farm Credit Administration show improvement in collections on all types of farm loans and indicate that farmers have lost nothing of their firm intention to meet their obligations in good faith and get out of debt. The borrowers from the Land Bank Commissioner have paid 86 percent of all the matured installments on their loans.

#### INTEREST RATE

In spite of anything that may have been said to the contrary, the rates charged are as low or lower than those charged industry by other Government agencies for long-time credit. I insert herewith a statement regarding the rates charged by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:

#### Current rate of interest or dividend by classes

	Percent
Loans under sec. 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended:	
Banks and trust companies (including receivers, liquidating agents, and conservators).....	4
Building and loan associations (including receivers).....	4
Insurance companies.....	4
Mortgage-loan companies.....	4
Credit unions.....	4
Federal land banks.....	3½
Joint-stock land banks.....	4
Livestock credit corporations.....	4
Agricultural credit corporations.....	4
Railroads (including receivers and trustees).....	4
State funds created for the purpose of insuring repayment of deposits of public moneys.....	4
Borrowers engaged in the fishing industry.....	5
Authorizations to industrial or commercial business under sec. 5 (d) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended:	
Loans.....	5
Purchases of participations.....	5
Loans on the assets of closed banks and trust companies under sec. 5 (e) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.....	4
Authorizations under the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended:	
Self-liquidating projects, sec. 201 (a), title II (including loans for financing repair or reconstruction of buildings damaged by earthquake, fire, tornado, or cyclone in 1933).....	4

<sup>1</sup> In cases where the corporation purchases securities of a railroad the interest rate is the same as that borne by the securities so purchased.

LXXX—306

#### Current rate of interest or dividend by classes—Continued

	Percent
Authorizations under the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended—Continued	
Financing exports of agricultural surpluses, sec. 201 (c), title II.....	5
Financing carrying and orderly marketing of agricultural commodities and livestock produced in the United States, section 201 (d), title II.....	4
Commodity Credit Corporation.....	3
Amounts made available for relief and work relief, sec. 1, title I.....	3
Authorizations under section 304, title III, of the act approved Mar. 9, 1933, as amended:	
Loans on preferred stock of banks and trust companies.....	3½
Subscriptions for preferred stock of banks and trust companies.....	3½
Purchases of capital notes or debentures of banks and trust companies.....	3½
Authorizations under section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1933, as amended:	
Loans on preferred stock of insurance companies.....	3½
Subscription for preferred stock of an insurance company.....	3½
Loans to or for the benefit of drainage, levee, and irrigation districts under section 36, title II, of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended.....	4
Loans to finance the acquisition of property declared unsafe, or the repair of property damaged by reason of flood, danger of flood, earthquake, conflagration, tornado, or cyclone, in 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936, under the act approved April 13, 1934, as amended.....	4
Loans to borrowers engaged in the mining, milling, or smelting of ores under section 14 of the act approved June 19, 1934, as amended, including loans on mineral acreage.....	6

<sup>2</sup> 3½ percent to Jan. 31, 1940, inclusive, and 4 percent thereafter.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation in this connection?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. FIESINGER. My understanding is that the people who have these loans do not have to make any payments until 1938.

Mr. JONES. They do not have to make any payments on account of principal.

Mr. FIESINGER. Notwithstanding this, they paid \$43,-000,000 on account of principal last year.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

#### RATES IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. JONES. It is also interesting to note that the rates being charged farmers in the United States for long-time credit are lower than those being charged in any other important country.

In Canada the interest rate is 5 percent; in Denmark, from 4 to 6½ percent; in Germany, from 4½ to 8 percent; in Great Britain, 5.2 percent; in Hungary, 7 percent; in Austria, 7 percent; in Bulgaria, 9 percent; in Czechoslovakia, 6 percent; in Latvia, 8 percent, and in Yugoslavia, 6 percent.

In one or two other countries the rates are comparatively low, but these are temporary provisions, and in no country of any consequence have I been able to find long-time rates that are as low as the rates charged for the different types of credit to the American farmer.

#### A SOUND SYSTEM

Not only has this institution operated successfully in the furnishing of interest rates to the American farmer lower than he has ever been able to obtain heretofore and also lower than those charged farmers in any other country, but the Farm Credit Administration has been able to do this and at the same time to keep the institution on a sound financial basis. All of its obligations are selling either at par or at a premium. This in itself is a fine tribute to the manner in which the organization has been handled.

To Gov. William I. Myers, who is the head of this institution, and to his corps of assistants, the American farmers and ranchmen owe a debt of gratitude. Without noise, without undue boasting, through long hours of difficult labor, they have performed a task of which the Nation may well be proud. [Applause.]



## OWNED BY FARMERS

Another vital feature of the Farm Credit Administration is that it is so organized and established that if kept sound it will finally be owned as well as controlled by the farmers themselves. It is peculiarly their own institution. They, above all people, are interested in keeping it on a sound basis. To put it on any other basis might gain a temporary advantage, but this would be done at a vast sacrifice to the farmers' long-range interests, because they could not hope to have it succeed and have it maintained on any other basis.

If those who are interested will but compare not only the long-range interest rates, but also the current interest rates which prevail under this institution with those which prevailed prior to its organization, they will appreciate all the more the fine accomplishments of this new organization.

## THE FINAL PURPOSE

The purpose of the Farm Credit Administration is not to get the farmer further into debt but to finance his current credit and to enable him, in so far as possible, finally to reduce or pay off his obligations and thus at last to be free. That the borrower is servant to the lender is gospel as well as the law of life. My chief purpose in advocating the lower interest rates is thus to decrease rather than to increase the farmers' obligations.

I again want to paraphrase a statement made by one of the most brilliant men that America has produced:

When every farmer in America shall eat bread from his own fields and meat from his own pastures and, disturbed by no creditor and enslaved by no debt, shall sit amid his orchards and vineyards and barnyards and gardens, planting his crops in their seasons, and growing them in independence, making wheat and cotton his clean surplus, and selling them in his own chosen markets, in his own time and manner, and not at a master's bidding, taking his pay in cash and not in a receipted mortgage, which, while it ends a portion of his debt, does not restore his freedom, then will be dawning the fullness of a new day.

Annual interest cost to farmer of a \$10,000 farm-mortgage loan obtained during the pre-war period at 6½ percent and refinanced by a Federal land-bank loan in 1933 at 5 percent, together with quantities of selected farm products required to pay such interest

Year	Annual interest payment			Quantities of selected farm products required for farmers to pay interest											
	Total	Paid by Treasury	Paid by farmer	Cotton		Wheat		Corn		Hogs		Butterfat		All farm products	
				Farm price July 15 (cents per pound) <sup>1</sup>	Bales required to pay interest (number)	Farm price July 15 (cents per bushel) <sup>1</sup>	Bushels required to pay interest (number)	Farm price July 15 (cents per bushel) <sup>1</sup>	Bushels required to pay interest (number)	Farm price July 15 (dollars per cwt.) <sup>1</sup>	Head (230 lbs.) required to pay interest (number)	Farm price July 15 (cents per pound) <sup>1</sup>	Pounds required to pay interest (number)	Index of prices received July 15 (1910-14 = 100) <sup>1</sup>	Index of quantity of all farm products required to pay interest (1910-14 = 100)
Average:															
1910-14.....	\$650	None	\$650	12.7	10.2	86.2	754	70.1	927	7.25	41	23.5	2,766	100	100
1915.....	650	None	650	8.4	15.5	104.6	621	78.3	830	6.84	43	24.2	2,686	99	101
1920.....	650	None	650	37.1	3.5	242.9	268	174.6	372	13.65	22	52.5	1,238	224	45
1925.....	650	None	650	23.4	5.6	140.3	463	104.4	623	12.02	25	40.5	1,605	149	67
1930.....	650	None	650	11.9	10.9	70.6	921	77.1	843	8.38	35	31.6	2,057	111	90
1931.....	650	None	650	8.5	15.2	36.3	1,791	54.0	1,204	6.20	48	21.1	3,081	79	127
1932.....	650	None	650	5.1	25.5	35.6	1,826	29.9	2,174	4.23	70	14.4	4,514	57	175
1933 <sup>2</sup> .....	500	\$50	450	10.6	8.5	86.9	518	55.4	812	3.98	51	23.0	1,957	76	91
1934.....	500	50	450	12.3	7.3	78.8	571	59.2	760	3.97	52	22.1	2,036	87	80
1935.....	500	150	350	11.9	5.9	76.4	458	82.4	425	8.40	19	22.3	1,570	102	53

<sup>1</sup> Crop Reporting Board, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

<sup>2</sup> Loan refinanced with Federal land bank at 5 percent.

Farm Credit Administration, Division of Finance and Research, Aug. 15, 1935.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further observation?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. FIESINGER. Seventeen mortgages were foreclosed out of one thousand in 1925. The number of foreclosures rose, but this year it is down to about 19 in 1,000.

Mr. JONES. The number is down very greatly. It rose one year to nearly 40 per 1,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am as anxious as anyone for low rates of interest. I think they will improve. We have really started, and I want to see this great institution builded into a finer

## THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

For many years there has been talk of restoring the purchasing power of the farmer; of giving the farmer his true place in the national economic picture; of giving him equality under the laws of our land. During most of these years this has been confined to rosy platform promises and to the eloquence of the political forum.

The present administration has translated some of these terms into a reality. [Applause.] The prices of farm products have greatly increased; benefit payments in large volumes have been made to the farmer in an effort to bring him up to the level of parity with other citizens of the land. To my mind the capstone of all these accomplishments is what has been done and what is being done by the Farm Credit Administration.

There are those who are never satisfied; there are those who continually complain because more has not been done. I hope the American farmer and ranchman will not mistake the form for the substance.

In one of Aesop's fables there is a story of the dog who had a piece of meat in his mouth. He came to a bridge across a small brook. Looking down into the clear waters, he saw reflected what he thought was a better piece of meat. Turning loose what he had, he grasped at the shadow of what he thought to be an improvement in his situation, and his efforts left him in a very real sense meatless.

The Farm Credit Administration may not be—it is not—perfect. But it is the farmer's own institution, fashioned to suit his own needs. He, above all people, is interested in its permanent operations.

I believe he will listen neither to the assaults of those financial institutions which would undermine its success to serve their own selfish ends, nor to those mistaken idealists who would risk the loss of this vast step forward in the way of accomplishment by grasping at things that cannot now be attained.

With the facilities that are at his command the future of the American farmer and ranchman is more nearly than ever in his own hands.

and more far-reaching structure. If we hurry it too much, if we insist upon too much, we may load it down. Let us keep it sound. Let us build to keep something that for the first time in the history of America has given the farmer a type of credit suited to his needs.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the figures which the gentleman is inserting in the RECORD is there anything to show who owns the balance of the farm mortgages other than those held by the Farm Credit Administration?



Mr. JONES. I have not the late figures, but in 1933, at the beginning of this program, a House document was printed which showed exactly the percentage of those held by the various lending institutions of the country. This is House Document No. 9, Seventy-third Congress, first session. Those figures would simply have to be brought down to date.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, that document shows the number held by the major financial institutions of the country.

Mr. JONES. Yes; the amount held by the land banks at that time, the amount held by insurance companies, and the amount held by different groups.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman mentioned the interest rates on farm mortgages in other countries.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Could the gentleman tell us how the interest rate on commercial and other loans in those countries compares with similar loans in this country?

Mr. JONES. I am sorry, but I have not that information. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, Kansas is the fourth State of the Union in the production of oil. Each year its petroleum products contribute millions of dollars to the wealth of the Nation. Each year its petroleum industry gives employment to thousands of people whose consuming power helps keep the railroads and the factories of the country occupied.

To give you an idea of the importance and value of the Kansas oil industry, let me cite the following figures:

Fifty million dollars was paid for Kansas crude oil during the year 1935.

Eight million and twenty-five thousand dollars was paid to the farmers and landowners of Kansas for rentals and royalties during the same year, which sum was more than half of the total amount of taxes levied on all the farms of Kansas.

Two million eight hundred thousand dollars went to Kansas farmers as bonuses paid on oil leases.

Three hundred and seventy-one million dollars has been invested by the oil industry in production in Kansas.

Sixty million nine hundred thousand dollars has been invested in oil pipe lines in Kansas.

Five million five hundred and ninety thousand dollars has been invested by the oil industry in natural-gas gasoline plants in Kansas.

Nineteen million seven hundred and fifteen thousand dollars represents the expenditures in the producing division for noncapital purposes in Kansas for 1934, the last year for which such figures are available. This includes salaries, wages, and material which is consumed as it is used.

Eight hundred and thirty-five new wells were drilled in Kansas during 1934, and in addition to oil 46,909,000 cubic feet of gas were produced in Kansas in 1934. In 1935 there were over 7,000 men directly engaged at full time in the production and refining end of the oil industry in Kansas.

All that these figures mean to the prosperity, the employment, consuming power, and the general welfare of the Nation is made possible by the fact that the oil industry in Kansas produced and had a fair market for its production of 54,787,000 barrels of crude oil during 1935. It just happens that for the same year this Nation imported 54,811,048 barrels of foreign oil, counting not merely petroleum but the various products thereof translated into their petroleum equivalent. So in effect we have imported into this country during the past year the equivalent of another oil State of the size and importance of Kansas. It was not necessary to import a single barrel of this oil. Our own producers could have produced many times that amount had it not been for the restrictions which it was necessary to place on the industry in order to prevent overproduction and consequent price demoralization. The State of Kansas alone could have produced more than this additional 54,000,000 barrels of oil which we unnecessarily imported. In fact, during the

month of February last, Kansas produced less than one-seventh of the capacity of its existing wells.

The whole Nation would object if we admitted as immigrants to this country the peons of Venezuela and Mexico who produce the foreign oil which dominates, in price at least, our domestic market. We would forcefully object to any legislative proposal which would take from American workers that employment and give it to those newly admitted immigrants who have been accustomed to work for a pittance a day. With millions of Americans unemployed, we would become justly indignant at any proposal to give well-paying jobs and positions to such a group of immigrants. We would be still more resentful if we admitted these immigrants, with their low standards of living, permitted them to displace American workers, and then granted them an exemption from all taxes which are paid today, directly or indirectly, by the same number of citizens in Kansas.

When we admit the products of these men we are for all economic purposes admitting them. We are permitting them to displace that number of American citizens who might have produced an equal amount of similar products in this country. We are to that degree eliminating employment opportunities for that number of workers in this country. We are transferring abroad the values which these products represent in human terms as well as in monetary values. We are taking opportunity and hope and faith in this country away from that number of Americans who may today be in our relief lines because the work which they might have done in the petroleum industry of this country has been done instead by the cheap peon labor of Venezuela and Mexico.

Have we gained anything by importing petroleum products equivalent to the production of another oil State of the size and importance of Kansas? Well, the importers brought this oil into the country for about \$3,000,000 less than they would have had to pay for the oil had it been produced in this country, so perhaps they received some benefit. But did the American people as a whole get any benefit from that \$3,000,000? Hardly. Cheap foreign oil is not so cheap when it reaches the consumer. Its cheapness lies in its low production cost. Very little of that low cost is passed on to the purchaser. Most of it goes to increase the profits of the importers. What does that \$3,000,000 in the pockets of the oil companies mean to the farmers, the landowners, and the workingmen of this country who are directly or indirectly benefited by the oil industry? It represents a loss of over \$8,000,000 to farmers and landowners. It represents a possible loss of nearly \$3,000,000 to them in bonuses. It means unemployment for approximately 7,000 men throughout a full year. It represents potential dividends, widely distributed, on over \$400,000,000 worth of invested capital.

After all, foreign oil is not really cheap. Actually its cost is high to the entire Nation, as well as to the petroleum industry. We are penny wise and pound foolish when for the slight saving of \$3,000,000 we sacrifice several times that amount, besides multiplying unemployment and increasing the problems of one of our most important domestic industries.

No one is proposing today that we close the door entirely to these imports. There is, however, before this Congress a suggestion in the Disney oil import bill, H. R. 10483, that these importers be required to bear a portion of the tax burden which is today carried by every form of American industry. This proposal suggests that imported crude petroleum and fuel and gas oil shall pay an excise tax of 1 cent a gallon instead of one-half cent now levied. This slight increase would still leave to foreign oil an advantage in production cost over domestic oil.

It is further proposed in this measure that a tax of \$2 per ton be levied on asphalt imported in this country. Foreign asphalt or asphalt made from imported asphaltic oils is today taking half of our asphalt market and reaping the advantages and benefits which Congress intended should accrue to American industry and American labor through the appropriation of hundreds of millions of dollars for road construction in this country.

The same measure proposes not an embargo on foreign oil or foreign oil products, but a definite limitation to 4.5 percent



of the American consumptive demand. Certainly there is nothing unfair about this when all of our large oil producing States have placed limitations upon the domestic production of oil and the Federal Government is cooperating by preventing the transportation in interstate commerce of oil produced in violation of State laws or regulations. It is therefore entirely logical and in harmony with our domestic policy to place a limitation upon imports. In fact, there are many people who feel that as long as domestic production must be cut down so drastically that imports should be shut out altogether. We are not asking for an embargo, however. We are merely asking that sufficient restrictions be placed on imports as will enable the domestic petroleum industry to more successfully advance its program of a balance between supply and demand. In other words, that American capital, American labor, and American landowners be given a fair chance to bring about the benefits which would accrue to this country by the addition of the oil production of another Kansas. [Applause.]

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I am introducing two resolutions pertaining to the payments of old-age benefits.

The first resolution provides for the appointment of a commission of nine members—three Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker; and three members to be appointed by the President of the United States. The duties of this commission would be to give further study to the old-age-pension problem with a view of recommending to the next Congress such amendments to the present social-security law as will make more permanent and adequate provisions for the aged of our land. A study of title I of the present social-security law convinces me that while, in my judgment, it is far from perfect, it is fundamentally sound and is a foundation upon which we can build. I am now referring only to title I of that act which pertains to an old-age pension and not to the other provisions. Title I can, in my judgment, be amended so as to give us an adequate old-age-pension law and go as far along this line of legislation as the Constitution permits the Congress to go. It is for this purpose I ask that a commission be appointed.

I have made no provisions in this resolution for the holding of further hearings, nor for the taking of testimony, nor does it contain an appropriation. We now have 2,500 pages of testimony taken by the Finance and Appropriation Committees of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House pertaining to this subject. It is more a question of studying the testimony we have than of taking more testimony. If additional facts are required, I am sure they are available without hearings. Should the committee to which this resolution is referred disagree with me, I shall cheerfully acquiesce in its judgment.

The question might well be asked, "Why not let the Committee on Finance and Appropriations of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House handle the subject?" My first inclination was to draft a resolution asking those committees to do so. However, when I considered the tremendous amount of legislation before these committees, the amount of work required of them and their chairman, I felt it was an imposition on them to ask them to devote more time to the subject—time which they should and are devoting to current legislation pertaining to taxation and the raising of revenues.

The second resolution amends the present Social Security Act. If passed, the following will become law:

First. Every aged single person would receive \$40 a month and an aged couple would receive \$60 a month.

Second. The Federal Government would contribute 80 percent instead of 50 percent of the amount paid.

Third. States must pay a pension to every aged person 65 years old or over who qualifies.

Fourth. No State can qualify under the act if it requires an aged person or persons to deed their home or homestead as a condition of payment of pension if that homestead is assessed for less than \$3,000.

While many States now have old-age-pension laws, few, if any, are paying substantial sums per month for the aid of the aged. While the sums they are paying will be duplicated by the Federal Government after July 1 of this year, such sums will, in my judgment, still be wholly inadequate. In my own State we are paying now some \$8 or \$10 a month per family. After July 1 this will be increased to from \$16 to \$20 a month per family, a sum which I think everyone will agree is wholly inadequate.

Most of us will acknowledge that many of the States, particularly in the South and West, find it impossible to raise enough money to pay their share under the present law. It is for this reason that I have provided in my second resolution that the Federal Government pay 80 percent of such cost and the State government 20 percent. This provision in itself does not contemplate the raising of more revenue than the original Social Security Act ultimately contemplated. It shifts the burden of raising an additional 30 percent of the necessary revenue from the State to the Federal Government. This will relieve some of the States now unable to raise their share and enable them to pay a more adequate amount.

The first amendment increases the amount to be paid to single persons from \$30 to \$40 a month, leaving the amount to be paid to husband and wife jointly at \$60 a month, as provided by the present Social Security Act.

The fourth amendment provides that no State can qualify under the act if such State requires the deeding or the conveying of the home or homestead of the aged person as a condition of payment if the assessed valuation of such homestead is less than \$3,000.

I wish to discuss the first and fourth amendments together. Let us take a concrete example as to how the law is working out in Michigan now. In my home State the State requires the deeding of the home as a condition of payment of old-age benefits. Think of an investigator coming into that old home and asking that father or mother or grandfather or grandmother to deed it to the State. Every wall echoes and reechoes with memories—memories of 40 or 50 years of married life and happiness of that old couple; every memory of a half a century; every joy and every sorrow that has transformed that house into a home comes back to those old people when they are asked now, as a condition of receiving those benefits, to deed away that old home. They will starve first. That old man will go out in the street and beg for a crust of bread before he will sign that deed. It does not help to tell them that they can live there as long as they live. They just cannot understand that sort of a policy. Neither can I. I consider it the most brutal and outrageous condition that can be imposed. I am therefore asking that no State can qualify under the law if it imposes such a condition. If the committee which is considering this bill does nothing more than to report out the bill containing this amendment, I feel it will have done much to eliminate criticism of the present Social Security Act. Much of the criticism that is really due to the State for imposing this condition or similar conditions is unjustly heaped upon the Federal Government.

Again, a husband is usually 4 or 5 years older than the wife when they are married. This means that the wife lives, as a rule, that much longer. The reason I increased the amount from \$30 to \$40 a month for single persons is so that the survivor, whether husband or wife, can continue to live in the old home after the other is gone. The same taxes, the same rent, insurance, heat, and light is required by one that is required by the two. While \$40 a month does not necessarily pay the expense of maintaining that home, it does help. I want them to live with their memories in that little home as long as either of them lives. I want them to retain their pride of ownership. I want to make it impossible for a State to require them to sign a pauper's oath or to make paupers out of them before they can receive the old-age benefits.

I sincerely hope that the committee will give this bill careful consideration and that it will be reported out now in order that we may pay more adequate amounts to the aged and eliminate the pauper's clause which the present law permits the State to impose.



After everything is said and done and all investigations made, you will find that the best and only effective answer we can give to any movement which advocates the payment of adequate pensions to our aged is not to promise to pay but to pay an adequate pension to our aged not next year or the year after, but now! [Applause.]

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, one of the great sources of my regret is that it is impossible to be at more than one place at a time. The duty of attending the hearings incident to the writing of the new tax bill as proposed by this administration takes up practically all of the time of a member of the Ways and Means Committee. I would have much preferred, so far as my personal pleasure is concerned, to have been on the floor this afternoon when the distinguished gentleman who is now presiding over this Committee delivered, I am told, a most eloquent Democratic campaign speech. I understand that in the course of his remarks he offered some advice to the Republicans. Or perhaps I should put it another way: He threw down a defy to the Republican Party with reference to its procedure at the convention to be held in Cleveland. If I have been informed correctly as to what the distinguished gentleman said, it was in effect that the Democratic Party expected to approve of the so-called reciprocal treaties in their platform to be adopted in Philadelphia and challenged the Republicans to oppose them on that platform.

Of course, it is rather difficult for anyone to say 3 months in advance what a large group of men and women representing a particular party will do in a convention; but unless I mistake all signs, the Republican Party at its convention in Cleveland will be only too glad to accept the challenge of the present occupant of the chair and "go to bat" before the people with one outstanding platform promise—and that is that we will repeal every reciprocal treaty put on the books by the present Democratic administration in contravention of the Constitution. I think perhaps that is about as plain as I could reply to what the gentleman evidently said; but tomorrow I shall be glad to look over his remarks more in detail, and if he has offered any arguments favorable to reciprocal treaties at some future time, I shall be very glad to proceed along the line of an argumentative discussion with him which we have been carrying on for the past couple of years.

The gentleman has had some recent recruits. So have I. Both sides are pretty well supplied. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] has been of very great assistance in showing up the fallacies of these reciprocal-trade treaties. The gentleman from Ohio has also had some recruits, which includes one of my intimate friends, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], who, as a songster, is much better than as a politician. There is another recruit on that side, my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. BUCK]. It is to Mr. BUCK's remarks on March 31 to which I address myself at this time.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31 a long list of what are described as concessions upon agricultural products granted to the United States under the trade treaties thus far negotiated.

It is comforting to know that in the negotiation of these treaties the interests of American farmers have not been entirely forgotten. We are expected to infer from his remarks that the farmer is not the forgotten man in the making of reciprocal treaties.

But the facts of the case are that the method of providing that comfort is only theoretical, not a reality.

It seems unkind to criticize those who have sought to relieve Congress of the burden and odium of tariff making, so a few observations may be in order. On the other hand, of course, tariff making is the duty of Congress, imposed by the Constitution, and a duty we ought not to shrink from by giving the President a blanket authority.

A large number of the concessions granted to this country under the trade treaties that have been negotiated are merely "paper" concessions. In many cases they merely

represent undertakings on the part of foreign governments not to increase the tariff on American products for the life of the agreement. In other cases, we are simply given the benefit of concessions granted to other countries, but there is no provision against increase at any time. In still other cases the quantities of American exports affected by the so-called concessions are negligible or even nonexistent.

For example, Canada cuts the duty on live horses from \$25 to \$12.50. Now that is fine, except for the fact that we do not export horses to Canada as a commercial proposition. I believe a few horses go over to Canada for breeding purposes, but as a commercial proposition, horses do not go over the Canadian line. The same is true of the rest of the livestock schedule of concessions intended to benefit this country.

Again, the Netherlands agrees to take 5 percent of their total import requirements of wheat flour and milling wheat from the United States; but here is the catch; if our prices on these are competitive with world prices. Think what a wonderful concession that is. Now take lard. Switzerland agrees to take from us 90 percent of her import requirements of lard, if and when she raises her present absolute embargo on lard. If I am not mistaken, 90 percent of zero is still zero. Perhaps some concessions of value may have been obtained for American agriculture, but these examples suggest strongly that many more of the supposed advantages will prove on examination to be like those I have described, of negligible or dubious value.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. THURSTON. Since these reciprocal trades have been made, we know, of course, they have included grain and dairy products; but have tobacco and rice and ship stores been included in any of the treaties we have made with these foreign nations?

Mr. TREADWAY. I doubt if any of them are included, but if the gentleman has looked them up, I am perfectly willing to take his word for it.

Mr. THURSTON. I wonder if the regional residence of the Secretary of State who drafts these treaties has had anything to do with the omission.

Mr. TREADWAY. The Secretary of State is a consistent free trader, as we know from our experience with him here in Congress.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BUCK. I am sure the gentleman wants to be accurate.

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, I am not positive as to the items mentioned. I will take the gentleman's statement for it if he wants to make it.

Mr. BUCK. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the note under the Swiss agreement to the effect that the Swiss Government will authorize the importation of lard within 3 months after this agreement goes into effect. So I trust the gentleman will correct his statement to the effect that there has been no concession made.

Mr. TREADWAY. If she raises her present absolute embargo on lard, is what I said in that respect.

Mr. BUCK. My recollection is that the gentleman stated there was no assurance that the embargo would ever be removed.

Mr. TREADWAY. And I do not believe what the gentleman has read gives us such assurance.

Mr. BUCK. There is a definite assurance, if the gentleman will pardon me, that it will be removed within 3 months.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; but at the same time the rates of duty on cheese and watches will be immediately removed, probably to offset any lard that we may send over there. If there is one thing that Switzerland wants to get into this country more than anything else, as the gentleman well knows, it is watch movements and parts of watches.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?



Mr. TREADWAY. For just one question, because I do not suppose the gentlewoman from California will want to yield me much more time.

Mr. BUCK. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's thought, but with reference to watch parts or with reference to any other matter of industry, the gentleman will recall that I put in these tables solely in the interest of agriculture and the farmer.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; and I also have some tables relating to farm products to put in the Record during the course of my remarks.

Mr. BUCK. I hope the gentleman will put in any tables he wants to include, and I call his attention particularly to the fact that the ones I referred to are concessions.

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not think the gentleman would deny the fact that horses are raised on farms, and if a concession from \$25 to \$12.50 per horse is of any value, it ought to mean that there are some horses going from our farms to the farms in Canada which, as a matter of fact, they do not do.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman will at least admit that in previous years, until Canada raised its tariff barriers, we exported great quantities of fruits, vegetables, and other articles produced in the United States.

Mr. TREADWAY. Of course, if the gentleman can get Canada to take off those duties and leave ours on, that is a different proposition; but that is not the scheme at all in a reciprocal treaty.

Mr. BUCK. I am willing to trade a little bit.

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, I have no doubt about that, because the gentleman probably regards the tariff as a local issue, and whatever part is beneficial to California is all right.

Mr. BUCK. Does the gentleman concede at least that these arrangements have been beneficial to California?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I do not think they have been of benefit to anybody in the United States, because we have got to consider this from the standpoint of a group of people rather than any local organization. Whether or not one particular item may benefit California, I do not know or care. I do know that your reciprocal treaties are terribly destructive of American agriculture, industry, and labor from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast.

Mr. RABAUT and Mr. BLANTON rose.

Mr. TREADWAY. Before I yield further I must be sure that I am going to have a little more time.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman from Michigan, I believe, was ahead of the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman says these reciprocal-trade agreements have not been of benefit to any industry. The gentleman knows that they have been of benefit to the automobile industry.

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not admit that. I have the proof right here, if I had time to go into it.

Mr. RABAUT. I will ask that the gentleman have additional time.

Mr. TREADWAY. I get my time from the lady from California.

Mr. RABAUT. They certainly have been of benefit to the automobile industry, and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. TREADWAY. I decline to yield further, and I will take care of the gentleman from Michigan in due time.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I cannot yield now. I will do as the gentleman usually does, and say, "Not just now, but later." [Laughter.]

Let us examine the price we are paying for these so-called concessions. In return for scattering concessions from nine countries, Cuba, Belgium, Haiti, Sweden, Brazil, Canada, Netherlands, Switzerland, Honduras—the agreements with Colombia and Nicaragua are not yet in effect—we have lowered our own agricultural tariffs all along the line to the entire world, Germany excepted. The detailed list was inserted by Senator DICKINSON in the Record of Monday, Jan-

uary 22, 1936, which I commend to your attention. The results of that policy are seen in the steady increase of competitive agricultural imports into the United States and the comparative decrease of agricultural exports, as seen from the Department of Agriculture's own tables of agricultural exports and imports.

Mr. Chairman, I have certain tables here which I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Last Monday I referred to the fallacy upon which the administration's trade-agreement program is based. Increased imports do not necessarily mean increased exports. As I have just pointed out, the theory breaks down completely when it is applied to agricultural exports and imports. The trade-agreement program is thus not only false in theory, being based on false premises, but is also a failure in fact. Moreover, it involves direct violation of President Roosevelt's explicit pledges to agriculture in the 1932 campaign. He has broken other pledges to other groups, but seldom to so many people at once. In his Baltimore speech of October 25, 1932, he said:

Of course, it is absurd to talk of lowering tariff duties on farm products. I declared that all prosperity in the broader sense springs from the soil. I promised to endeavor to restore the purchasing power of the farm dollars by making the tariff effective for agriculture and raising the price of his products. I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived.

Well, if they have not been deceived, they will vote for the Republican ticket in November.

Again at Boston, on October 30, 1932, Candidate Roosevelt said:

I favor—and do not let the false statements of my opponents deceive you—continued protection for American agriculture. I favor more than that. I advocate measures to give the farmer an added benefit, called a tariff benefit, to make the tariff effective on his products.

Contrast these definite pledges to our farmers with the President's action in granting extensive concessions on foreign agricultural products as contained in the Canadian and other agreements, including such commodities as cattle, cream, cheese, poultry, corn, apples, lima beans, peas, potatoes, tomatoes, sugar, tobacco, and so forth.

To quote further from the President, in his message to Congress of March 16, 1933, in connection with the A. A. A. bill, he said:

Deep study and the joint counsel of many points of view have produced a measure which offers great promise of good results. I tell you frankly that it is a new and untrod path, but I tell you with equal frankness that an unprecedented condition calls for the trial of new means to rescue agriculture. If a fair administrative trial of it is made and it does not produce the hoped-for results I shall be the first to acknowledge it and advise you.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is reading his speech against the rules of the House.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am not reading my speech against the rules of the House. If the gentleman knew more about the rules he would not make such remarks.

Mr. McFARLANE. The gentleman might do me the courtesy to yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have extended every courtesy to the Democratic Members that my time permitted.

We all know the story of the Triple A, and how the administration is persisting in its bankrupt policy of crop restriction in the face of the Supreme Court's decision of last January.

More recently in a speech to the American Farm Bureau Federation at Chicago December 8, the President made the following pledge with respect to the Canadian agreement:

Some of the same type of individuals and groups are also trying to stir up farmers against other phases of the broad recovery program. Dispensers of discord are saying that farmers have been victimized by the new reciprocal-trade agreement with Canada, and are painting pictures of a great flood of imports of farm products rushing across the border. Just as I am confident that the



great masses of city people are fair-minded, so I am sure that the great majority of American farmers will be fair in their judgment of the new trade agreement. If the calamity howlers should happen to be right you have every assurance that Canada and the United States will join in correcting inequalities, but I do not believe for a single moment that the calamity howlers are right.

I am now calling upon him to state whether these pledges, all of which bear on the trade-agreements program, represented serious undertakings or whether they are merely scraps of paper. The trade-agreements program as now administered is a failure so far as regaining our export markets for agricultural commodities is concerned. At the same time, by admitting increasing competitive agricultural products it is undermining any hope for restoring agricultural prosperity. It is in opposition to his original pledges to agriculture.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I would be glad to yield to my friend, but I have so little time.

Mr. BUCK. Oh, I can get the gentleman additional time.

Mr. TREADWAY. But I cannot accept additional time.

Mr. BUCK. I want to ask the gentleman if he is making a serious assertion that the increase in agricultural imports is the result of the reciprocal-trade agreements.

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I am just stating the facts, that the agricultural imports have tremendously increased, showing that we need all of the tariff that we can get upon them and not the reductions that the trade agreements make.

Mr. BUCK. I misunderstood the gentleman. Other Members on his side have claimed that these increases in agricultural imports are due to the trade agreements.

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, no; but these are statistical facts that I am giving. The imports have tremendously increased.

Mr. BUCK. I have no objection to the gentleman stating those facts.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am putting in statistical facts.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. I call the gentleman's attention to one item in the Canadian treaty in which there has been a very large increase in imports. Take the matter of Cheddar cheese. The imports from Canada in January 1935 were 180,264 pounds, while the imports in January 1936 amounted to 706,714 pounds.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I call upon the President to make good on his word that he would change his agricultural policies if his plans did not work out. Certainly the trade treaties have not benefited agriculture. They should be scrapped and the attention of the administration turned to sane and constitutional methods of aiding agriculture in its quest for home and foreign markets and for a fair American price for its products.

#### The trend of export movement

Year and month (ended Dec. 31)	Wheat, <sup>1</sup> including flour	Tobacco (leaf)	Bacon, <sup>2</sup> hams, and shoulders	Lard <sup>3</sup>	Apples (fresh)	Cotton, <sup>4</sup> running bales
	1,000 bushels	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 bushels	1,000 bales
1932.....	82,118	387,766	84,175	546,202	16,919	8,916
1933.....	26,611	420,418	100,169	579,132	11,029	8,533
1934.....	36,538	418,983	83,725	431,237	10,070	5,753
1935:						
January.....	1,257	28,943	5,108	17,667	1,281	466
February.....	1,301	23,616	4,158	15,890	1,490	390
March.....	1,500	31,062	5,428	10,636	945	318
April.....	1,281	16,761	5,332	7,193	397	323
May.....	1,426	16,661	7,443	9,740	44	278
June.....	1,195	11,867	6,662	6,877	17	345
July.....	1,232	14,581	6,580	4,915	99	280
August.....	1,278	22,382	5,210	3,406	544	241
September.....	1,324	52,371	3,531	1,515	1,349	487
October.....	1,485	60,068	3,355	2,731	2,190	712
November.....	1,320	64,117	4,961	7,932	1,854	1,135
December.....	1,132	38,753	3,923	7,853	1,496	886
Total.....	15,731	381,182	61,691	96,355	11,706	5,861

<sup>1</sup> Wheat flour is converted on a basis of 4.7 bushels of grain equal to 1 barrel of flour.

<sup>2</sup> Includes Cumberland and Wiltshire sides.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes neutral lard.

<sup>4</sup> Excludes linters.

Foreign Agricultural Service Division. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States and official records of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

#### The trend of agricultural imports<sup>1</sup>

Year and month (ended Dec. 31)	Cattle, live	Beef, canned <sup>2</sup>	Wheat, grain <sup>3</sup>	Corn, grain	Oats, grain	Barley, malt <sup>4</sup>	Egg <sup>5</sup> products
	1,000 head	1,000 pounds	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds
1932.....	106	24,639	3	344	59	52,533	3,085
1933.....	82	41,344	31	160	132	109,183	3,664
1934.....	66	46,674	7,737	2,959	5,580	193,728	3,178
1935:							
January.....	6	4,142	843	1,877	1,644	17,449	363
February.....	38	4,225	1,055	1,826	2,118	15,459	398
March.....	53	7,690	1,458	3,304	2,596	27,197	420
April.....	51	9,496	1,611	1,445	2,167	30,701	370
May.....	49	7,076	847	3,306	1,124	37,794	1,022
June.....	34	5,911	625	6,122	406	43,728	1,199
July.....	18	5,220	793	5,649	29	42,041	790
August.....	16	5,740	2,570	8,554	1	27,136	646
September.....	14	7,752	3,644	2,986	7	27,566	602
October.....	32	5,379	5,324	4,690	5	16,933	668
November.....	40	6,811	4,348	1,651	2	18,916	613
December.....	27	6,867	4,321	2,092	8	15,703	540
Total.....	378	76,309	27,439	43,242	10,107	320,623	7,631

<sup>1</sup> General imports prior to 1934; beginning Jan. 1, 1934, imports for consumption.

<sup>2</sup> Imports for consumption.

<sup>3</sup> Includes corned beef.

<sup>4</sup> For domestic consumption and includes only wheat full duty paid and 10 percent ad valorem.

<sup>5</sup> Excludes eggs in the shell.

Foreign Agricultural Service Division. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States and official records of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, on March 18 I introduced a resolution of inquiry, in which I requested, among other things, first, all facts pertaining to the death of one Victor A. Barron, an American citizen, who met his death while in the custody of police at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, on or about March 5, 1936.

Then I also inquired as to what was done by the Honorable Hugh S. Gibson, American Ambassador to Brazil, to protect the American citizen, Victor A. Barron.

In reply to that inquiry the Committee on Foreign Affairs presented a letter from the Secretary of State dated March 25. That letter read, in part, as follows:

The Embassy at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, reported to the Department on March 5, 1936, that Mr. Barron had stated on March 4 that he was willing to indicate the street where Prestes and his companions left his car, provided he was guaranteed that he could return to the United States, and that the police had agreed and intended to put him on a steamer sailing for New York on March 5.

One important feature in this report is as follows:

The Embassy's report indicates that Mr. Barron was taken on March 4 from the prison to police headquarters and pointed out on the city map the exact spot where Prestes and his companion left his car. He was then allowed, in the company of a detective, to go to a barber shop in town and to dine at a restaurant. On his return to police headquarters he was told in the presence of a representative of our Embassy that all arrangements were being made for his embarkation on the following day, and that instead of returning to prison he would be given a special room at headquarters. Upon his return to police headquarters, Mr. Barron appears to have been greatly perturbed mentally, and it was only with great difficulty that he could be persuaded to go to a room which the police had arranged for him on the second floor overlooking a patio. At 8 o'clock the following morning he succeeded in evading the guard and committed suicide by plunging into the paved area of the patio two stories below. The Embassy stated in this connection that he had made a previous attempt to commit suicide.

This letter also said that moreover upon learning of Barron's arrest the Embassy did everything it could to see that he would not be subjected to third-degree methods, and that so far as the Department is informed its efforts met with success.

I ask you to bear in mind two things, first, that on March 4, as the Secretary of State informs us on information which he received from the American Embassy to Brazil that this prisoner Barron was escorted to a barber shop and then to a restaurant and then returned to police headquarters, and that at police headquarters "in the presence of a representative of our Embassy all arrangements were made for his embarkation." Second, I call



attention to the fact that the Embassy contends that it had done everything, and that its efforts had met with success, to prevent the prisoner from being subjected to third-degree methods. At the time I received this information I knew that it was incorrect, but I did not have proof to attack the credibility of the statements contained in this report. Since then I have received proof. I have here a copy of a letter which was sent by one Joseph R. Brodsky, an attorney with offices at 100 Fifth Avenue, New York City. This attorney was in Rio de Janeiro on March 4 and on March 5. He was sent by the father of Victor A. Barron to look after the interest and welfare of Victor A. Barron and on March 12 he sent the following letter. This attorney I say is in New York and is ready, willing, and able to come to Washington and appear before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and establish and substantiate every statement that he makes in this letter. Bearing in mind the two statements contained in the report from the American Embassy, I now read you a copy of the letter which was sent by Joseph R. Brodsky. He says:

Just boarded ship for Trinidad, and so this is the first opportunity to write details concerning Barron and the Bergers.

Since strict censorship applied in Rio to mail and radio, it was agreed that I should hold the report till I reached "foreign" soil, that is, as soon as I walked up the gangplank. Here goes.

Barron:

One. He did not squeal.

Two. He did not commit suicide.

Three. He was tortured to death, and then his body chucked out of a third-floor cell to a concrete yard floor in the jail yard, and a lying statement issued that he jumped to his own death, actuated by remorse.

The story given to the press by the authorities is as follows:

That at a conference in jail, attended by Police Commissioner Mueller and American Consul Sauer and Barron, the commissioner agreed that if Barron would disclose the whereabouts of Carlos Luis Prestes, he (Barron) would be promptly released; that, relying on his promise, Barron gave Prestes' hideaway; that the police thereupon grabbed Prestes and that the next day, when Barron realized what he had done, remorse drove him to commit suicide, and he jumped to his death. A neat story, but a damnable lie.

Now, either this lawyer is telling the truth or the American Ambassador to Brazil is telling the truth. I know this lawyer. I served a part of my clerkship in his office. I can vouch for his honesty, veracity, and integrity. I am willing to stake my reputation on his word. However, we will leave that aside, and we will go to something which is more conclusive, from the standpoint of court evidence, than the word of this lawyer. I go to the report of the autopsy performed on Barron the day after he died. Mr. Brodsky states that this report of the autopsy indicated the following. He says, reading from his letter:

Barron was tortured from the time of his arrest until they killed him; they stabbed him and beat him with belts and rubber hose; they burned and shocked him with live electric wires; they squeezed his private parts till he was unconscious; they punched and kicked him around constantly; they did not let him sleep; for days they wouldn't let him sit down—no bed was provided—no chair—water was denied him. He only rested when he fell unconscious. Then they would bring him to in order to start all over again.

The kid wouldn't talk.

In fact, he didn't know where Prestes was living.

Finally, some cunning sadist struck on the following idea: Get Barron drunk and he'll talk out. Barron wouldn't drink the liquor they offered him. They cajoled and threatened, but he remained adamant. So they decided to force the raw alcohol down his throat. They did—they busted his upper jaw and teeth in the process; they tore his nostril—they filled his stomach with liquor forced down through his mouth and nose. Human endurance, even of a young hero, couldn't stand more—and Barron died. This recital is verified by the doctor that made the autopsy. Then with a dead man on their hands they realized they had to cover their dastardly act, and they threw the dead and tortured body out of the window—and reported suicide. The bruises caused by the torture—ah, that is a result of his fall—the motive, remorse. But nobody is fooled.

This particular inhuman treatment, this torturing, is substantiated by the autopsy report performed on this man, who was found on the concrete pavement of the yard surrounding the police headquarters in which he had been incarcerated.

Now, how can this statement and that from the Embassy be reconciled? If the representative of the American Am-

bassador was present on March 4, as the report submitted to us by the Secretary of State says, then the American Ambassador's representative had knowledge of the torture that was going on. This is a physical fact, and you cannot get away from it. This man is supposed to have died on March 5. The representative of the American Ambassador was there on March 4. The autopsy performed on March 5 shows conclusive evidence of torture. If we take the Ambassador's own statement that his representative was present, then his representative must have had knowledge of it. If he was not present, then his report is a lie. If he was present, then the representative is guilty of complicity.

When the Ambassador states that they did everything to prevent third-degree methods and that they succeeded in preventing these third-degree methods, in view of the autopsy report, in view of the statement of this man's attorney, that statement is a lie.

I submit that this is a very serious situation. Here we have a statement based on a report from the American Ambassador. This American Ambassador should be given an opportunity to explain, I will grant that, but at the same time the rights of this American citizen and those who represented those rights should be given a hearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I charge that the American Ambassador or his representatives either concealed this torture, either were implicated in the questioning of this man, or were absolutely criminally negligent in failing to prevent the torture of an American citizen on foreign soil. In view of this report, in view of the fact that I am ready to bring a witness to Washington, to bring a man who knows these facts of his own knowledge, in view of the autopsy report, I maintain that unless some investigation is conducted of this matter, unless something is done by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, unless the State Department takes action, unless this matter is cleared up by a thorough investigation, then I say the American Ambassador to Brazil stands convicted before the public of having "played ball" with the police of Brazil.

I am not prone to make charges of this character unless I know my facts. I have a statement from this man's lawyer, based on the autopsy. How can the American Ambassador, in view of this statement from this man's lawyer, in view of this autopsy report, say that they protected this man, say that they succeeded in protecting him from third-degree methods? How can the Ambassador to Brazil state that there was a representative of his present? If that statement is correct, then that makes him guilty of criminal negligence. It makes the American Ambassador to Brazil or his representative guilty of having stood by without doing anything to prevent the torture during the torturing and the questioning of this man.

Mr. LAMBETH. Why does not the gentleman state the circumstances?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Barron was arrested for allegedly having driven around a man by the name of Prestes. Prestes was the leader of the National Liberation Alliance, composed of all groups, labor organizations, liberal organizations, and to a certain extent even the church, who are fighting the dictatorship of the Vargas government. This group is demanding that in Brazil the property of imperialistic interests—such as the Standard Oil, the British and other financial interests—be so curtailed and expropriated as to return the land to the people of Brazil. The Brazilian Government sets up a dictatorship to protect these interests. This American is accused of having driven around a leader of the opposition. He is taken to prison. He is tortured to death, and the American Ambassador comes back and says he was not tortured but that he committed suicide; that we had our representative there and prevented the use of third-degree methods on him. Certainly the American Ambassador should be investigated, and if these facts that I have stated are substantiated to the satisfaction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, then I submit the American Ambassador should be recalled.

Now, there is one other matter that I want to take up, and that is the use of W. P. A. for strikebreaking in the city



of New York. Today there is a heroic strike going on in New York City on the part of the seamen of the steamship *California* and the steamship *Harding*. It is an effective strike. These men are fighting for decent working conditions and decent wages. They want to establish for the Atlantic coast the same conditions that they have on the Pacific coast.

What happens? The ships are tied up; these seamen are winning a victory on the economic battle front, and along comes the W. P. A. and sends W. P. A. men as scabs to break this strike. To what purpose are relief funds appropriated for the unemployed being used? When we appropriated this money did we intend it to be used against organized labor in the United States when organized labor goes on the picket line? I have an admission from the W. P. A. to the effect that scabs have been used and a promise that they would discontinue the use of scabs. I sent the protest to the Works Progress Administration and received the following letter from them:

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1936.

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO, M. C.,  
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On March 27 you sent a wire to Mr. Harry L. Hopkins complaining that the Works Progress Administration in New York City was sending W. P. A. workers to take jobs of striking seamen.

We have been in touch with the New York City Works Progress Administration and have been advised that a dispute exists between factions of the International Seamen's Union. The main body of the I. S. U. advises that no strike exists, and we are informed that preparations are being made by the recognized officers from the I. S. U. to secure an injunction against the faction now picketing the docks. We are of the opinion, however, that W. P. A. should not be involved in this matter and have advised that no more W. P. A. workers be assigned until the union is able to settle its own differences.

Very truly yours,

NELS ANDERSON,  
Director, Section on Labor Relations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Despite this promise to use no more W. P. A. workers as scabs, I received this morning a telegram from the chairman of the strikers in which he says they are still using these men, and specifically mentions the ship on which they are used, the steamship *President Harding*, and states that these men are taken from W. P. A. at Van Brunt and Sullivan Streets, Brooklyn, to go and work on ships tied up by the strike.

The latest thing in America is the use of W. P. A. to break strikes. We stand up here and demagogue and say that the Seventy-fourth Congress is doing a great deal for labor; yet we permit the use of Federal money to break strikes in the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain data and excerpts which I want to incorporate in my speech.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(At the expiration of his 20 minutes, Mr. BLANTON was granted additional time in order to enable him to conclude his speech.)

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, wise words from Abraham Lincoln—

We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know to have been gotten out at different times and different places, and by different workmen—Stephen, Roger, Franklin, and James, for instance—and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they actually make the frame of a house or mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece

too many or too few—not omitting even the scaffolding—or, if a single piece be lacking, we can see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared to yet bring such piece in—in such case, we may find it impossible not to believe that Stephen, and Franklin, and Roger, and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked on a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck.—Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, no greater sage ever lived in the United States than Abraham Lincoln. He was a skillful lawyer. He was a logical reasoner. He was an astute philosopher. He had a wonderful intellect. He was a deep thinker. He was intimately familiar with the problems of life, and for those harassed by them he had an understanding sympathy. He had an incisive perspective. When he talked, his hearers listened intently, for Abraham Lincoln always knew what he was talking about.

NO UNKIND FEELING—NO REFLECTION

At the outset of my remarks I want it known clearly and distinctly that I entertain no unkind feeling toward, and intend no reflection whatever upon, any person whose name is mentioned in my speech. I merely present facts as they have been unfolded in our investigations. If the facts condemn anyone, I did not make the facts.

UNCOVERING SECRET PRECONCERT

Just as Abraham Lincoln was able to recognize secret preconcert in his time, we who have come after him, by applying his formula above quoted, are able to recognize the secret preconcert carried on in our day, and to discover the different parts that different conspirators played in designing and erecting their objective.

STEPHEN, ROGER, FRANKLIN, AND JAMES

To every intelligent, unbiased, unprejudiced person who will carefully study same with an open mind, I intend in this speech through facts and incontrovertible evidence to prove beyond peradventure of a doubt that Dr. Charles A. Beard, Dr. George S. Counts, Dr. W. W. Charters, and Dr. Frank W. Ballou were the master minds who, aided by Ada Comstock, Harold O. Rugg, Carleton J. H. Hayes, and Charles E. Merriam, confederated, conspired, and worked together for 5 years in a deliberate, preconcerted plan to communize schools and colleges in the United States, and particularly the public schools of Washington, which are partly financed by the United States Government, Dr. Frank W. Ballou voluntarily and sympathetically acting as their secretary for 5 years, and at all times since collaborating with them.

DISCOVERING WHO PUT COMMUNISM IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which frames the annual appropriation bill for the District of Columbia, upon the insistence of Superintendent Frank W. Ballou and Senator COPELAND, allowed in the 1934-35 bill the sum of \$63,385 to install character education in the Washington schools. We assumed that it would be installed in all of the 175 different schools of the public-school system of Washington, and that the kind of character education that Superintendent Ballou had in mind would be the worth-while kind that would help to cultivate in the hearts and minds of the 99,000 Washington school children a greater respect for law and order, for our Constitution and institutions, honesty, truthfulness, kindness, regard for the rights and interests of others, loyalty, devotion, and patriotism to flag and country, sobriety, clean living, and abstention from vices and harmful practices. We never dreamed that Superintendent Ballou had an ulterior motive or that he intended to inculcate subversive doctrines. A year passed. That \$63,385 was spent, and wasted.

Superintendent Ballou then demanded \$87,540 for character education in the 1935-36 bill. Reputable teachers advised us it was a farce and that nothing worth while had been accomplished. We learned that there had been no attempt and there was no plan to attach it to but 10 schools, 5 white and 5 colored, wholly ignoring the other 165 public schools in Washington which embraced most of the school children in the District of Columbia. We learned that to guide it Dr. Frank W. Ballou had placed his said coworker and cocollaborator, Dr. W. W. Charters, in charge of it, notwithstanding the fact that Dr. W. W. Charters is a



professor in the great Ohio State University, which at all times needs his undivided attention at Columbus, but Superintendent Ballou and his Washington Board of Education nevertheless employed Dr. Charters and allowed him to commute back and forth from Columbus, Ohio, to Washington, D. C., and paid him out of the appropriation made by Congress the sum of \$50 per day and all traveling and subsistence expenses.

#### HOUSE STOOD OUT AGAINST FURTHER WASTE

We members of the House committee refused to allow Superintendent Ballou this additional \$87,540 requested by him for so-called character education, and we refused to put it in the House bill last year, and on a proposal then vigorously made from the House floor to insert the \$87,540 by way of an amendment, the House of Representatives voted down the amendment and refused to allow it.

#### BALLOU THEN CENTERED FORCES ON SENATE

Then Superintendent Ballou importuned the Thomas-Copeland subcommittee of the Senate to give him his \$87,540, which, remember, was additional to the \$63,385 the Thomas-Copeland subcommittee of the Senate had caused to be given Ballou the preceding year, and Senator COPELAND caused the appropriation for character education to be inserted in the bill as a Senate amendment. In the conference that ensued between the House and Senate the House conferees refused to agree to it. The conference became deadlocked and the Senate conferees held it up for many weeks. The House conferees were given to understand that unless they agreed to the Copeland amendment, allowing the appropriation for character education, there would be no bill, even though the conferees might agree on all of the other 113 amendments the said Senate subcommittee had placed on the House bill.

#### BALLOU SAID HIS CHARACTER EDUCATION WAS NOT TEACHING MORALS

Our committee knew that in his address in New York City on his Washington Experiment in Character Education, Dr. Ballou had said, "It is not teaching morals." We began to wonder just what it was teaching. In his testimony before our subcommittee (hearings, p. 477) Dr. Ballou testified: "What we are trying to do is to set up a new philosophy of education." And referring to his teachers who were teaching character education, Dr. Ballou said: "Whose philosophy has got to be changed fundamentally" (hearings, p. 482). Such a ridiculous assertion caused the following comment from the distinguished gentleman from Missouri:

Mr. CANNON. It seems to be a rather startling statement that the philosophy of all teachers engaged must be changed in order to introduce character training in the schools. I had supposed that the philosophy of every good teacher includes character training (p. 482).

Later the following question was asked and answered:

Mr. BLANTON. Do you mean, Doctor, that the philosophy of education of the 2,900 teachers of the Washington schools has to be changed fundamentally?

Dr. BALLOU. I mean exactly that.

#### TERM "CHARACTER EDUCATION" WHOLLY MISLEADING

Dr. Ballou well knew that if you were to ask 1,000 parents whether or not they would be in favor of "character education", or "character training" as he sometimes expresses it, all would say "yes" without hesitation, as they would all assume it would be the right kind. They would not assume that it meant "character debasement." They would assume that would inculcate honesty, truthfulness, kindness, patriotism, respect for law and order, clean living, and abstention from vices. They would not know that back in his mind undisclosed to them Dr. Ballou had no intention whatever of teaching these worthy traits of character, or that in his speech in New York he would admit that his "Ballou character education" was not teaching morals, he knowing at the time that his "new philosophy" system was teaching "immorals" and moral debasement.

#### DID NOT KNOW THEN WHAT WE KNOW NOW

At that time our committee had made no investigation of the matter, and never dreamed of the terrible situation that later we discovered exists in the Washington public

schools. We House conferees were faced with the problem of adjusting 114 amendments the Senate had placed on the House bill. The only way the matter could be adjusted was for an agreement to be reached between the House and Senate conferees. It was necessary that the annual supply bill should be passed, for otherwise the District of Columbia would be without its \$40,000,000 appropriations needed for the coming fiscal year. We House conferees were assured that the bill could not pass unless the House agreed to the Copeland amendment granting Dr. Ballou his second annual appropriation for his "character education."

#### COMPROMISE

Finally, in order to pass the District appropriation bill before Congress adjourned, the House conferees agreed that they would allow the appropriation for character education if the Senate would agree to a provision that would prevent communism from being taught or advocated in the Washington schools, and the Senate conferees agreed to insert the following language:

Hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the payment of the salary of any person teaching or advocating communism.

Which provision after being read by the Clerk on both the House floor and Senate floor on June 6, 1935, was agreed to unanimously by both House and Senate, and is now permanent law, and went into effect July 1, 1935.

#### REBELLED AGAINST LAW

The Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Frank W. Ballou, did not like this law. He claimed that it infringed on his "academic freedom", and the "academic freedom" of his teachers, whom he wanted absolutely unhampered and unrestricted. He claimed that the law prevented "factual instruction." Dr. Ballou caused the Board of Education to request an opinion of the corporation counsel, who on September 5, 1935, rendered a clear and decisive opinion, holding just the contrary, and advising that the law passed by Congress did not prevent "factual instruction", but only prevented any and all attempts to indoctrinate.

From Corporation Counsel Prettyman's opinion, he furnished, at the request of the Board of Education, which opinion he introduced in our hearings, I quote the following:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL,  
September 5, 1935.

#### To the Commissioners:

We think that the word "communism" refers to the governmental forms and theories of the present-day Communist parties composing the Internationale. Chief among their economic and political tenets are (1) the abolition of private ownership of property and the substitution therefor of a system of common ownership, (2) control of the government by the proletariat (wage earners without property), that is, a dictatorship by the proletariat, (3) the destruction of present systems of government and the substitution therefor of other systems adapted to the theory of proletarian dictatorship. These tenets are, of course, directly opposed to the established American system, which includes among its principal bases private ownership of property, governmental control by a majority of all classes, periodically expressed, and a governmental system, legislative, executive, and judicial, designed to function in accordance with these concepts. The congressional intent in the present statute was obviously directed to the protection of this system against internal attack.

The word "advocate" is easy of definition in this context. It means to plead for or to urge the adoption of.

Much more difficult is the exact definition of the limits of the word "teach" as it appears here. In ordinary parlance it may mean to enlighten, or to indoctrinate, or to nurture, or to train. Clearly, any teaching of communism which has for its purpose or its intended effect the nurture, the training, or the indoctrination of the pupils in communistic thought is forbidden by this statute.

But I am of opinion that the mere informing of pupils concerning the history, existence, or theories of the communistic governments or parties is not prohibited. Obviously Congress did not mean to prohibit comment or instruction which is adverse to communism, that is, teaching against it. Neither does it seem to me that the congressional intent reaches to the recital, without any shadow of favor or support, of factual data, whether historical, economic, or political. There is a vital difference here between teaching and teaching about. To state that communism exists is not to teach it. To state what Communists believe is not to teach communism within the meaning of this statute, provided that the method or manner of statement does not imply approval.



Thus I am of opinion that the mere recitation or study of factual data is not the teaching prohibited by this statute. But I am also of the view that any shadow of favor or support of communism shown by or reasonably to be drawn from such recitation or study is prohibited.

E. BARRETT PRETTYMAN,  
Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia.

#### SUPERINTENDENT WENT INTO TANTRUMS

Dr. Frank W. Ballou and the controlling majority of his supine board of education decided to ignore the law. They did not like it. They would have none of it. They had been trained in the communistic doctrine "that teachers must not allow 'ignorant majorities' to dictate to them." They had been trained that they could do as they pleased by demanding the right of "factual instruction." They had been trained that they could have their own way and teach just what they pleased by demanding "academic freedom." Superintendent Ballou refused to instruct his 2,900 teachers that they must obey the law passed by Congress, as interpreted by Corporation Counsel Prettyman. He refused to tell them that they had the right to explain the evils of communism, but that it would be unlawful for them to make any attempt to indoctrinate it.

#### FORCED AFFIDAVITS TO BE REQUIRED

Under the circumstances, the Comptroller General of the United States, Hon. J. R. McCarl, who is the head of the General Accounting Office and whose duty it is to require all public money to be paid out in strict accordance with the law, required the teachers to make affidavit that they had not violated this law before he would allow them to draw their money. He in no way stopped or prevented proper factual instruction.

#### DID NOT SEE FIT TO DO IT

To show that by instructing his teachers that they must obey the law passed by Congress as construed by the corporation counsel, Dr. Ballou could have stopped all affidavits, I quote the following from our printed hearings:

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, is it not a fact that I proposed to you that if you would advise the teachers of Washington that Congress had passed a law that they should neither teach nor advocate communism, that the Comptroller General would withdraw that requirement, and that the teachers would not be required to make any further affidavits? Didn't I propose that to you?

Dr. BALLOU. You proposed that to me.

Mr. BLANTON. You could have submitted that suggestion to the Board of Education yourself, could you not?

Dr. BALLOU. Well, I have not.

Mr. BLANTON. You could have done it, couldn't you, Doctor?

Dr. BALLOU. I could have done anything as far as that is concerned.

Mr. BLANTON. You did not see fit to do it, Doctor?

Mr. BALLOU. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that you replied to me that you would never agree that the right of the teachers to teach according to their method of teaching should be taken away from them?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say this to you now, Doctor, that if you will instruct your teachers tomorrow that Congress has passed a law that prevents them from teaching or advocating communism in the public schools, and this law must be obeyed, I know that this committee can have Comptroller General McCarl withdraw the requirement of those affidavits immediately. Now, if the affidavits are inconvenient aren't you willing to issue that instruction to them?

Dr. BALLOU. I am not authorized to issue that instruction until the Board takes action.

Mr. BLANTON. You were not sufficiently interested in the matter to have proposed it to the Board of Education.

#### INCITED HENCHMEN TO ACTION

Dr. Frank W. Ballou, who had been trained in the communistic Teachers College of Columbia University and who for 5 years had acted as secretary for a commission dominated by the leading Communist professors, George S. Counts and Charles A. Beard, was determined that he would carry out the teachings of "Counts and Beard" and not allow any "ignorant majority" to hamper or in any way control his teachers. To Ballou, Counts, and Beard an act of Congress was the act of "an ignorant majority." He decided the best way to accomplish his purpose of evading the law and of getting it repealed was to force the affidavits, and not do one thing to cause their elimination, but to prate much about "inconvenience to teachers" and "a gratuitous insult to patriotism of teachers", and "an evi-

dence of lack of confidence", because affidavits were required, when by simply agreeing to obey the law he could have caused all affidavits to be eliminated. He appealed to the ready ear of all henchmen. He falsely claimed that he and his teachers were denied the right of "free speech." He falsely contended that they could not expound "factual instruction." He charged they were denied "academic freedom." He and other communistic sympathizers tried to belittle and ridicule the law by calling it "the red rider", and later they called it "the little red rider."

#### HOWLING AND RAGING AND GNASHING OF TEETH

All of the radicals in Washington immediately began to howl. They wanted "academic freedom." All the Communists in the Nation's Capital began to rage and froth at the mouth. They wanted their "academic freedom." They all wanted to expound "factual instruction." They did not want any "ignorant majority" to hamper or restrict them. They immediately started to work the pink sheets, the red sheets, and the subsidized sheets, which proceeded daily to fill their columns with clamoring propaganda demands for "free speech" and "factual instruction" and "academic freedom." They finally interested the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sisson], whose Senator had forced the appropriation for "character education." He is not a member of the District legislative committee, which handles all District legislation. He is not a member of the District appropriation committee. He is not a member of the committee on education. Nevertheless, he became intensely interested all of a sudden about a law the House of Representatives had passed unanimously on June 6, 1935, and began to introduce bills.

#### TWO SISSON BILLS—DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED TO EACH OTHER

On January 20, 1936, the gentleman from New York introduced the bill H. R. 10391, "To make more effective the law against advocating communism in the District of Columbia", which specifically provided that teachers could give instruction concerning "the political, economic, or social system of any country", but held intact the existing law preventing any attempt to indoctrinate communism in the public schools.

That bill did not suit Dr. Frank W. Ballou. He still wanted his "academic freedom." He wanted the right for his teachers to teach what they pleased. He did not want any restrictions around them. He did not want to be hampered by any "ignorant majority."

That bill did not suit the majority of Dr. Ballou's servile Board of Education. They, too, wanted "academic freedom."

That "more effective" bill did not suit the pink sheets, the red sheets, or the subsidized sheets. They all insisted on complete and absolute "academic freedom"

That bill "to make more effective the law against teaching communism in Washington schools" did not suit the radicals in Washington, both in and out of Congress. That "more effective" bill did not suit the Communists in the Capital of the United States. They all wanted "factual instruction." They all wanted their "academic freedom." They all cried for it. They all howled for it. They all howled for it. They all clamored for it. They all raged and gnashed their teeth. They all insisted that they would have nothing less. They wanted all law repealed. They wanted no law. They wanted to be free to do exactly what they pleased, to teach exactly what they pleased, to indoctrinate exactly what they pleased, and they were not going to allow Congress, even though it did so by a unanimous vote of both House and Senate on June 6, 1935, to restrict or exercise any control whatsoever over them. Hence they proceeded to get a second "Sisson bill" that suited them.

#### SECOND SISSON BILL TO REPEAL ALL LAW AGAINST COMMUNISM

So on February 21, 1936, under hue and cry, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sisson] introduced his second bill, his new H. R. 11375, to repeal outright the law that prevents indoctrinating communism in the public schools of Washington, D. C.

This new Sisson bill pleases Dr. Frank W. Ballou. It gives him his long-cherished "academic freedom" to teach and indoctrinate what he pleases. It suits his obedient Board of



Education. It pleases all the pink sheets. It pleases all of the red sheets. It pleases all of the subsidized sheets. It pleases all of the radicals, both in and out of Congress. It pleases all of the Communists and their sympathizers. They all want it. They all cry for it. They all howl for it. They all bawl for it. They all clamor for it.

**BUT WASHINGTON CITIZENS DO NOT WANT THE LAW REPEALED**

My colleagues will remember that on Saturday night, March 28, 1936, there was a meeting of the Federation of Citizens' Associations, which embraces 63 different associations of citizens here in Washington, and by a vote of over 2-to-1 majority they refused to endorse the Sisson bills, but approved the report of their committee, standing firmly behind the law preventing communism from being indoctrinated in the public schools. It is interesting to know that the president, the first vice president, the second vice president, the secretary, and the treasurer of the federation of 63 citizens' associations all voted against the Sisson bills and all voted in favor of the law that prevents communism from being indoctrinated in our schools and approved their special committee's report.

**CITIZENS' SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO ELIMINATE COMMUNISM**

This nonpartisan special committee, selected by the federation of 63 citizens' associations, was Hon. George E. Sullivan, who unselfishly and at great sacrifice rendered magnificent service in trying to eradicate communism from Washington schools, chairman; Hon. Harry N. Stull, vice president; Mrs. George Corbin; and Mrs. Horace J. Phelps. One is a prominent Catholic and the other three are prominent Protestants. All four worked in harmony. The following federation resolutions were passed:

1. Resolution adopted by the federation March 16, 1935, advocating a rider upon the then pending District of Columbia appropriation bill, in view of the disclosure that Dr. Charters (shown to be on the advisory board of communistic Moscow University summer school), was being employed for character education in the District of Columbia public schools.
2. Resolution adopted by the executive committee November 12, 1935, providing for the creation of this special committee and the taking of steps to eliminate textbooks in the District of Columbia public schools containing communistic propaganda and secure for the pupils instead "a clear and informative definition of communism and its evil and atrocious aims and purposes."
3. Further resolution adopted by the executive committee December 3, 1935, directing this special committee to extend its work to cover periodicals as well as textbooks.
4. Resolution adopted by the federation December 7, 1935, approving and endorsing the aforesaid actions by the executive committee.
5. Resolutions adopted by the federation January 4, 1936, advocating an immediate appeal to Congress to provide "an effective remedy, and one which will be so thorough that there can be no danger of a recurrence of existing conditions."

I quote the following from said special committee's report:

**COMMITTEE REPORT APPROVED AND ADOPTED MARCH 28, 1936, BY FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE VOTING DOWN BY IT OF A PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE MOTION TO ENDORSE THE SISSON REPEAL BILL, H. R. 11375**

**MARCH 28, 1936.**

*To the Federation of Citizens' Associations, District of Columbia:*

The last report of this special committee, dated January 4, 1936, was approved by the federation, and resolutions were adopted on that date describing "existing conditions" in the public schools of this District as "favorable to subversive, antipatriotic, and communistic propaganda", and expressly declaring that "the recent action of the Board of Education makes it imperative that the Congress of the United States shall be appealed to without delay to provide an effectual remedy and one which will be so thorough that there can be no danger of a recurrence of existing conditions." This special committee has made appeal to the Congress as so directed by the federation, the subject matter being presented to the Senate and House District Committees, and also to the House Appropriations Committee.

The Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the House Appropriations Committee conducted a thorough investigation into this subject matter. The entire subcommittee of five members participated actively in the investigation, and went to original sources for their data. Books and magazines, etc., in use with pupils in the public schools were carefully studied by said subcommittee, with such books, magazines, etc., actually before them for weeks; and the printed hearings show that the subcommittee found an abundance of antipatriotic and procommunistic matter, and also matter tending to seriously affect and undermine fundamental morals of the pupils in the matter of sexual relations. The destruction of sexual morality is well known, of course, to be one of the aims and purposes of communism. The Superintendent of

Schools, the head of the history department in the high schools, and the editor of Scholastic magazine were heard before said subcommittee and disclosed no possible excuse or justification for the conditions against which this federation has complained, and which are now admitted to have been going on for a number of years.

Your special committee has carefully considered all of the foregoing and recommends that the federation deal specifically with the following issues which have been raised.

1. So-called academic freedom: We recommend that the federation reject as fundamentally unsound the proposition advanced by Congressman Sisson and by the Board of Education that it is an invasion of the rights of the school authorities for Congress to direct, regulate, or control any features of the curriculum in the public schools. No one has been able to suggest wherein this proposition has any foundation in American institutions; exclusive legislation for the District of Columbia is vested by the Constitution in the Congress, and the school authorities are public servants obligated to respect and obey such legislation. It should be noted in this connection that as early as 1886 (act of May 20, 1886 (24 Stat. L. 69)), Congress upheld its jurisdiction, not only in the public schools of the District of Columbia but in schools everywhere else subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, by expressly requiring "the nature of alcoholic drinks and narcotics, and special instruction as to their effects upon the human system" to be taught, and to require removal from office of anyone failing or neglecting to comply with such requirement.

2. Legislation requiring pupils to be acquainted with evil aims and effects of communism and other un-American doctrines: Since Congress has the undoubted power to require pupils to be acquainted with the harmful effects of alcohol and narcotics, which affect the individual only directly, and the Nation indirectly, how can anyone seriously question the power of Congress to require that pupils in the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be made acquainted with the evil aims and effects of communism and other un-American doctrines, which affect both the Nation and the individual directly? This special committee recommends that the federation advocate the immediate passage of legislation to this effect, with means for enforcement similar to what is provided for in the aforesaid act of 1886, and with specific requirement that all such subversive doctrines be expressly denounced to the pupils in all textbooks or other data or explanation used with the pupils referring to such doctrines. This is in accord with the uniform position taken by this federation at all times. Not only has the federation at no time objected to pupils in the public schools being made so acquainted, but it has insisted at all times upon the pupils being made so acquainted for their own protection; in other words, that the truth, and not half truths, shall be told the pupils about and against communism and that it is inherently impossible to tell them the truth about communism without teaching against communism and denouncing it as a world revolution conspiracy seeking destruction by force and violence of all nations and practically every vestige of civilization.

As a matter of fact, the clause against communism in the aforesaid District of Columbia appropriation bill of June 14, 1935, does not require any monthly or other affidavits; and it was not until December 1, 1935, that the Comptroller General decided to make such requirement, and then only because it became apparent that the school authorities would not accede to the reasonable demand of Congress (inherently necessary) that no teaching about communism could take place which did not actually teach against and denounce it.

GEO. E. SULLIVAN, *Chairman*,  
HARRY N. STULL,  
MRS. GEORGE CORBIN,  
MRS. HORACE J. PHELPS,

*Special Committee on Elimination of Communist Matter from District of Columbia Public Schools.*

**FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS APPROVED FOREGOING REPORT**

The foregoing report of its special committee, made after 16 months of close study and careful investigation of communism in Washington schools, was approved and adopted last Saturday night by the Federation of Citizens' Associations, by a vote of over 2-to-1 majority. It was heartily supported by Col. James G. Yaden, who until recently was the president of said federation, and by all of the high officers of said federation. Colonel Yaden is one of the finest citizens of Washington and is well known to practically all Members of Congress.

**REPRISAL AGAINST TEACHERS**

When Superintendent Ballou reported to the Board of Education at its meeting yesterday that Supervising Principal S. M. Ely, who as the delegate of the North Capitol Citizens' Association in said federation had dared to vote against said Sisson bill Saturday night, and had dared to vote against repealing the "red rider", Henry Gilligan, a member of said Board of Education, indicated that action would be taken against said school principal. It is such browbeating tactics that is making teachers afraid to express their sentiments



against communism. It was this same Henry Gilligan, who at said meeting yesterday said that we had no authority to request information as to how many teachers there are in the schools here who have had training in Columbia University, and that such request ought to be denied, he asserting that Congress had no control over the schools or the Board of Education. It was this same Henry Gilligan who 6 years ago when communism was being investigated in the Washington schools on April 2, 1928, said that Congress did not have any right to say how the schools should be run in Washington, and he made a motion to appoint a committee to register the Board's protest against a provision passed in the District appropriation bill; all of the above you will find reported in the Washington Post.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL ASSOCIATION, EMBRACING 90 DIFFERENT CITIZENS' ORGANIZATIONS, AGAINST SISSON BILLS AND FAVOR "RED RIDER"

I quote the following from a statement of Maj. Gen. Amos A. Fries, retired, which he has prepared to submit to the Senate Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. Chairman, I am submitting this statement as president of the Public School Association of the District of Columbia, and in the name and on behalf of that association, an association of groups of civic, fraternal, business, and citizens already existing under other titles, but who are particularly interested in the public schools of the District. There are over 90 of these citizens' groups in the association. The various groups are taxpayers, citizens of the District of Columbia, and some of the teachers themselves. The great majority of them have now, or have had, children in the public schools, and are most concerned with the proper teaching and training of their children.

They pay the taxes that provides the money to build the school-houses, maintain the grounds and buildings, pay the teachers, and then feed, clothe, and care for the children. These parents feel that they are the ones to say what shall be taught their children and what shall not be taught them, and not the teachers. They feel that the teacher who is unwilling to take this view of the position of the parents is not fitted to teach and should get out of the public schools.

These parents strenuously object to ill-considered and wholesale experiments being practiced on their children, just because some professors or superintendents want to try out their particular ideas of methods of teaching, or social philosophies, economic theories, or even trying to teach a form of government foreign to that of the United States.

The District of Columbia Public School Association is vigorously opposed to the teaching of communism in the schools, or to the repeal of the law against teaching or advocating communism in the schools, unless and until a law is passed which will make mandatory the denunciation of the ideas, philosophy, and actual working of Communist governments, whenever the subject of communism is touched upon by any teacher in the public schools of the District.

The association is equally opposed to the appropriation of any more money for the so-called character-education experiment. It believes that the experiment is an absolute waste of the taxpayers' money and that certain of the schemes being carried out are actually detrimental to the children's future. It is to prepare our children for citizenship in the "new social order", but what that is Dr. Ballou says he does not know himself.

The public school association, without a dissenting vote, passed the following resolution against any further money being appropriated for the so-called character-education experiment:

Resolution adopted unanimously by the District of Columbia Public School Association, April 1, 1936

Be it resolved by the District of Columbia Public School Association, That they are opposed to the appropriation for any further money for the so-called character-education experiment in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and they urge that any funds that might be available for such character-education experiment be used to employ additional teachers in the various grades where they are seriously needed.

AMOS A. FRIES,  
President of the District of Columbia Public School Association.  
DISTINGUISHED GENERAL IN WORLD WAR

Maj. Gen. Amos A. Fries during the World War was Chief of the Poison Gas Division of the United States Army in France and performed distinguished service. Since his retirement, besides taking an active part in many civic matters, he has been at the head of the American Legion in the District of Columbia. His valuable and untiring efforts, bravely and unselfishly performed, in trying to eradicate communism from the public schools of Washington deserve the commendation and thanks of every father and mother in America.

ADDITIONAL \$78,660 DEMANDED BY BALLOU FOR HIS SO-CALLED CHARACTER EDUCATION

When, on February 6, 1936, we began hearings on the 1936-37 District appropriation bill, Dr. Ballou demanded \$78,630 as a third annual appropriation for his so-called character education. Our committee had become convinced that the two preceding appropriations had accomplished nothing whatever of value, but, besides being wasted and thrown away, had been used in an attempt to communize the public schools of Washington.

One teacher of high standing wrote:

I have attended all of Dr. Charters' \$50 lectures; not a posted teacher present heard anything new; the meetings were wholly void of interest, and not one thing of value did he elucidate.

Another reputable teacher wrote:

Unless the teachers have been made afraid to speak their real sentiments, they all will tell you that the whole thing is a farce.

Another wrote:

Do you wonder why Dr. Ballou put his character education in only 5 white and 5 colored schools and was willing for his other 165 schools to go without it? The answer is he knew he couldn't communize all of the teachers at the same time. He had to work gradually his "new philosophy" and "change them fundamentally" just a few at a time.

Another wrote:

I send you five of the little pamphlets which were distributed to the teachers at old man Charters' meetings, three printed by the council at 744 Jackson Place and two by Jacks, one printed in February 1929 and the other in January 1931. Why pay Charters \$50 per day to come here from Columbus, Ohio, to distribute these worthless leaflets?

The "breadwinning" one by Jacks is six pages, and the following is its main paragraph:

When we call our civilization "industrial" we mean precisely that. We mean that "industry", mechanized for the most part, as it happens to be, commercialized almost entirely, infinitely complicated, and yet forming a unitary system—for we speak of the "industrial system"—is the vocation, occupation, employment by which the world of our day has to earn its living as a world, by which the age in which we live has to carry itself on into the future. And as pig killing is the major influence, which makes the pig killer what he is for good or ill, and art work the major influence which acts in the same way on the artist, so, too, the essential qualities of our civilization, good or evil, will be found to have a distinct dependence on the essential qualities of the universal "industry" which supports and carries it on.

The pamphlet entitled "Integration", by Dr. Charles R. Mann, whose record as a radical I will mention later, was published in July 1934, reprinted from the Educational Record, and its main paragraph, quoted from Happy Days, is the following:

Here we are in the C. C. C. We're 300,000 fellows out of work, unfit to handle a job, to vote intelligently, to choose a wife, or to raise children. Yet in 10 years most of us will have made a stab at all of them. And we'll have made a mess of it! Is America going to let our kids grow up to be the impractical, untrained, and ignorant drifters that we are?

That is an unfair picture of C. C. C. enrollees. My camp at Lake Abilene embraced 250 Negroes, all World War veterans. Most were married, some were teachers, some preachers, and all were law abiding.

I agree with these teachers, that Dr. Ballou's "experiment" is a farce. In what way will the above pamphlets train or aid teachers to teach character education? I agree with these teachers that if, instead of wasting this big sum of money each year, Dr. Ballou had paid it to additional grade teachers to lighten the load of the others, it would have done much more good.

DAMNING ADMISSIONS BY DR. BALLOU AND HIS PROFESSOR JONES

As to whether or not our subcommittee would allow the \$78,660 demanded by Dr. Ballou for his third successive appropriation for so-called character education, we held extensive hearings, embracing the testimony of Dr. Ballou; Prof. George Jones, head of the history and social-studies departments; Mrs. Doyle, the president of the Board of Education; Hon. George E. Sullivan, the chairman of the special committee of the Federation of (63) Citizens Associations; Major General Fries, president of the District of Columbia Public School Association, which embraces 90 affiliated organizations in the District; Editor Robinson, of the



Scholastic; and other witnesses, and the members of our subcommittee reached the unanimous opinion that studied efforts were being made to communize the public schools of Washington; that the money spent on so-called character education had been wasted and thrown away; and the additional \$78,660 demanded by Dr. Ballou should not be granted, as he had a subtle, ulterior purpose of using "character education" as a cloak or means of indoctrinating (1) all of his 2,900 teachers and (2) the 99,000 school children with communism, and that there should be no repeal of the law, designated by Communists as the "red rider", that prevents teachers from indoctrinating communism in the Washington schools. The admissions made by Dr. Ballou and his Professor Jones were sufficient alone to warrant the above conclusions.

#### ACTION APPROVED BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives is composed of 39 Congressmen. Most of them have served in Congress many years. They handle all of the annual appropriation bills, and before money can come out of the United States Treasury they must authorize it. At a meeting of the Appropriations Committee called for that purpose, our subcommittee reported its action to the Committee on Appropriations, and not an amendment was offered to their 83-page bill, and not a voice was raised against it, and not a vote was cast against it, and by a unanimous vote it was reported to the House of Representatives. For 2 days this 83-page bill was before the House of Representatives under general debate. On the third day it was read for amendment, which allowed debate after each paragraph. Not an amendment was passed. The House of Representatives passed the 83-page bill without any change in it whatever, and on a roll-call vote there were only 26 votes against it.

#### OPPOSITION DID NOT MATERIALIZE

The Washington Post for February 7, 1936, carrying his picture taken by the Post, under large headlines, "Teachers' oath parody planned by Representative Scott" and "To ridicule 'red baiters' with rider to 1937 District bill", said:

Representative Scott, of California, has voluntarily assumed the role of baiting the "red baiters" in the House yesterday and warned that he is going to offer an amendment to the 1937 District bill as a parody on teachers' oath measures.

"You see what happened last year with regard to the District bill, because nobody outside of the conferees knew what was going on", he said.

Yet not an amendment was offered to the bill relating to teachers' oath or to insert money for "character education", but the House of Representatives passed the 83-page bill without any amendment to it and with only 26 votes against it.

#### CRITICISMS ABOUT PASSAGE OF "RED RIDER" UTTERLY RIDICULOUS

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 6, 1935, shows that Congressman CANNON of Missouri, in the House of Representatives, moved the adoption of the so-called "red rider", and that from the desk the Clerk of the House read it to the House, to wit:

Hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the payment of the salary of any person teaching or advocating communism.

The above proposal was duly read by the Clerk in the open session of the House without a voice raised against it, and the RECORD shows it was adopted by a unanimous vote. If it did not suit the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sisson], then was his time to speak. Then was his chance. Then was his opportunity. Then was his duty to tell the House what objections he had to it. He then had an opportunity to speak against it. He could have made a privileged motion to concur in the Senate amendment without the above proviso, which would have had precedence over the Cannon motion. If there was not a quorum there he could have made the point of order and forced a quorum. If he had wanted to vote on the matter he could have called for it, and then could have called for a division, and then could have called for tellers; and, finally, he could have called for the yeas and nays. But he did nothing. He allowed it to pass unanimously. He can-

not say that he was asleep and did not hear the Clerk read it. He cannot say he was not paying attention. He cannot say that he did not know what was going on in the House of Representatives. For in any of such contentions he would be admitting a failure of duty on his part for which no other Member was responsible.

There is no rule of the House that requires the leaders to report to all of the 435 Members everything they propose to take up in the House every day.

#### NOT "RED RIDER", BUT RIDER AGAINST "REDS"

This law was not for "reds." It was against "reds." It was to curb "reds." It was to keep them out of schoolrooms. It was to keep their subtle, poisonous influence away from children.

#### LIKEWISE PASSED IN SENATE UNANIMOUSLY

On June 6, 1935, this law to stop communism in schools, called by communistic sympathizers the "red rider", was read at the clerk's desk in the Senate and passed by unanimous vote of the Senate.

#### SISSON BILLS HANDLED BY SUBCOMMITTEE

A subcommittee of five Members—embracing Mrs. VIRGINIA E. JENCKES—from the Committee on the District of Columbia has the Sisson bills before it for hearing. Representative JENCKES strongly opposes both Sisson bills and complains as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1936.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on District Appropriations,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BLANTON: I regret exceedingly to learn that all copies of the hearings you conducted on the requested appropriation of \$89,000 for so-called character education, which unearthed the facts regarding communism in our Washington schools, have been exhausted, and that it is impossible now to obtain a copy. I realize that furnishing a copy to each of the 435 Congressmen, and to each of the 96 Senators, left very few for distribution to the interested citizens of Washington. I wonder if it is not possible to find some way to have additional copies printed.

You are probably aware that the District Legislative Subcommittee, of which I am a member, has been conducting hearings on the bill advocated by Congressman Sisson, of New York, to repeal the law which prevents Washington teachers from indoctrinating communism. Congressman MAVERICK, of Texas; Congressman SCOTT, of California; Congressman MARCANTONIO, of New York; and Congressman ZIONCHECK, of Washington, all joined Congressman Sisson in contending that the existing law to prevent indoctrinating communism is an abridgement of the right of free speech, and they have been joined and upheld by Congressman SCHULTE, of Indiana and Congressman BREWSTER, of Maine, who are members of my subcommittee.

When I was attempting to present my evidence against the Sisson bill before our subcommittee, to save time, I asked leave to print the evidence of Dr. Ballou, that of Professor Jones, that offered by myself and my clerk, that of General Fries, that of Mr. Sullivan, that of Mr. Lange, that of Mr. Robinson, editor of Scholastic, that of Mrs. Doyle of the Board of Education, that of Corporation Counsel Prettyman, and the report of the Civic Council of Defense of California, Inc., which were printed in your hearings on the appropriation bill, now exhausted. I was granted this permission. In view of the fact that I was granted this permission, neither Mr. Sullivan, General Fries, nor myself offered any further testimony, relying implicitly on having the above-mentioned testimony in our hearings.

To my great surprise, those who are trying to hurriedly pass the Sisson bill have now refused to print any of the above-mentioned evidence in our committee hearings, which will leave the hearings one sided. This is a fair exhibition of what these so-called disciples of free speech mean by free speech, that is, they want only their side heard.

Very sincerely yours,

VIRGINIA E. JENCKES,  
Sixth District, Indiana.

#### WHAT WASHINGTON NEWSPAPERS REPORTED

The Washington News on March 25, 1936, under headlines "Mrs. JENCKES Denied Reprint of 'Red Rider' Evidence; 268 Pages of Testimony at Stake", said:

Mrs. JENCKES asked to incorporate in the Sisson bill hearings the 268 pages of testimony on the same subject before Representative BLANTON's House Appropriations Subcommittee. The District Committee at its last session refused to reprint. Mrs. JENCKES moved to have that action reversed. It failed to receive a second.

Mrs. JENCKES, an ardent supporter of the Blanton rider banning teaching of communism in District schools, claimed she made this testimony a part of her own. She said Chairman KENNEDY, in charge of the Sisson bill, had agreed to include it.



Representatives SCHULTE (Indiana), BREWSTER (Maine), and SHORT (Missouri) all objected. Mrs. JENCKES reminded the committee that she could have read into the Sisson bill hearings every word on the "red rider" before BLANTON's group.

The Washington Herald for March 26, 1936, under headlines "Comfort for Communism" and "Exposé of School Reds Is Blocked", and "Testimony Supplied by Mrs. JENCKES Out of Record", said:

Those anxious to have communism taught in District public-school classrooms banded together yesterday to strike from the hearings on the Sisson bill strong anticommunistic evidence introduced by Representative VIRGINIA JENCKES, of Indiana.

At hearings on the Sisson bill, which seeks to repeal the law prohibiting teaching of communism, Mrs. JENCKES inserted in the record 268 pages of testimony relative to communism in the District, which was given before the House District Appropriations Subcommittee.

When permission to include this evidence was granted, Mrs. JENCKES and representatives of patriotic and civic organizations opposed to the Sisson bill, cut short their testimony.

While Mrs. JENCKES was ill the District Committee voted to strike out of her testimony the evidence offered before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

The Washington Star, March 26, 1936, indicated that Chairman NORTON wanted Mrs. JENCKES brought before the subcommittee and cross-examined and made to support her charges against the school board.

#### HER CHARGES SUPPORTED BY EVIDENCE EXCLUDED

I submit that the 268 pages of testimony introduced by Mrs. JENCKES, and which she thought was going into the hearings, but which was excluded and not printed by the District Committee, will support the charges made by Mrs. JENCKES. Since all available copies of the printed hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee are exhausted, and since the District Committee would not print same in its hearings, although introduced by Mrs. JENCKES, a member of such committee and of the subcommittee holding the hearings, and since most of the principal witnesses against the Sisson bills, therefore, placed only a small part of their testimony before said subcommittee, believing that it would appear in full in the 268 pages introduced by Mrs. JENCKES, it therefore becomes necessary for me to quote extensively from the Appropriations Subcommittee hearings, which I will do hereafter before I conclude this speech.

#### VIRGINIA ELLIS JENCKES, OF INDIANA

I want to pay her my humble tribute. Her paternal ancestors lived in Vincennes, Ind., for four generations. She was born in Terre Haute, living there since her birth. Widowed since 1921, she has fought a valiant fight against all the battles of life and, without help, has overcome the obstacles that beset us all.

VIRGINIA JENCKES is a remarkable woman. She is not just a salary drawer. She is a worth-while Representative. She is one of the hardest workers in Washington. She gives legislation close study. She tries to find out what is the right or wrong side of every issue that arises. She is an active, loyal friend to every person who labors for daily bread, and union labor has never had a more loyal supporter. She has worked faithfully for all disabled war veterans, has helped them to be hospitalized, to receive just compensation for injuries, and to obtain just treatment from the Government. She diligently attends to the business of her constituents.

VIRGINIA JENCKES is a loyal, patriotic American. I am proud of her and her many worthy accomplishments. Every good mother in the United States may approve her service here without hesitation. She fights for laws that protect the home. She fights for laws that protect the welfare of children. She is spunky and brave. She fights for the things that are worth while. She ought to be a Texan. I want the Sixth District of Indiana to know that it has here a most valuable Representative.

#### TEACHER SUSPENDED FOR PROPAGATING COMMUNISM

Before any Member of the present District of Columbia Committee ever came to Congress, I was here when a teacher in the Western High School was suspended for teaching communism. The minutes of the Board of Education show that, upon a charge of propagating "bolshivism and communism while discussing current events in an English class",

this teacher, whose name is there mentioned, upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Education unanimously ordered the suspension.

#### COMPLAINTS EVER SINCE

I will quote from our printed hearings numerous complaints before I conclude. Within a few sessions after said teacher in the Western High School had been suspended for teaching communism, this Congress was forced to pass a law to stop such radical teachings. It was the original "red rider." But it has not been mentioned by any Washington newspaper or by any other communist sympathizer. By a strange coincidence a former very distinguished and beloved colleague from the State of Washington—Dr. Summers—caused this original "red rider" to be passed. He was a Republican leader here who had the respect and confidence of every Member. He said, on May 3, 1924, that teachers in the Washington schools were teaching disrespect to the Holy Bible and that ours is an inferior form of government, which are two of the main communistic teachings.

#### FIRST "RED RIDER" TO STOP COMMUNISM PASSED MAY 3, 1924

Four years after Dr. Frank W. Ballou became the \$10,000-per year superintendent of the Washington schools, it became necessary for Congress to pass a law to stop communism from being taught by his corps of teachers. I quote the following from page 7796, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, 1924, being volume 65, part 8, Sixty-eighth Congress, and it will be noted that I refused to make a point of order, because Dr. Summers had convinced me such a law was necessary:

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Summers of Washington: Page 33, at the end of line 22, insert: "Provided, That no part of this sum shall be available for the payment of the salaries of any superintendent, assistant superintendent, director of intermediate instruction, or supervising principal who permits the teaching of partisan politics, disrespect to the Holy Bible, or that ours is an inferior form of government."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not make a point of order to that.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is a limitation, and of course it is in order.

I think everyone will agree with me that no teaching of this kind should be permitted in the schools of this District nor in the public school of any city or town in any State in the Union.

I have spoken to a number of Members, and it is an exception to find one who does not say that his children have come to him with complaints in regard to one or the other of the points mentioned in this amendment.

In the interest of the highest possible standard of education in this city, and because I believe that the schools here should be as nearly as possible a model for those throughout the country, I think this thing ought to be stopped, and this amendment will have that effect.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Has the gentleman information that such things are going on in the schools which his amendment is intended to reach?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I have.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Who will pass upon the question as to whether this is happening or not? Who will be the arbiter?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The school board.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will not the man who issues or pays these warrants be the one? This being a limitation on this appropriation, will they not pass this question up to the accounting officers of the Government?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. All right.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In a practical way, I would like to know how that is going to work.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It might be up to the accounting officers. Anyhow, there would be a way then by which one might file a complaint and stop the payment of salaries to anyone who has been permitting this pernicious teaching. It has unquestionably been going on for years, and is going on in this present year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, may we have it again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

(The amendment was again read.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

#### FIRST "RED RIDER" PASSED IN 1924 BY HOUSE AND SENATE

After passing the first "red rider" in the House on May 3, 1924, Dr. Summers then had to battle Dr. Ballou, who tried



to get the Senate to knock it out of the bill. Even at that early date Dr. Ballou raised his pet slogan of "academic freedom", but the Senate passed it and the President signed the bill and the first "red rider" became law, but was effective only until July 1, 1925, when it would expire.

#### SECOND "RED RIDER" PASSED SECOND TIME IN 1925

Again in 1925 Dr. Summers' "red rider" to prevent communism from being taught in the public schools of Washington was placed in the District appropriation bill, and passed both the House and Senate and was signed by the President, and became law in force and effect until July 1, 1926.

#### DR. BALLOU AND COMMUNISTIC HENCHMEN KEPT IT OUT OF NEXT BILL

The hue and cry of "factual instruction" and "academic freedom" was then started by Dr. Ballou and the Washington newspapers. They belittled and ridiculed the law. They belittled and ridiculed every Congressman or Senator who espoused it. They succeeded in keeping it out of the next appropriation bill, and the law expired on July 1, 1926. That is the reason that when the last "red rider" was passed by Congress on June 6, 1935, it was not drawn as a limitation that would expire with the fiscal year, but was drawn as permanent law by using the word "hereafter", so that Congress would not have to pass it again every year.

#### COMMUNISTS ADOPTED PUBLIC UTILITIES' PROGRAM OF SUBSIDIZATION

We learned recently from the Communist literature that they had adopted the method used by utilities in influencing public opinion; that is, to get the press, some prominent teachers, and some prominent preachers on their pay roll. Until we have a thorough, up-to-date investigation of Communists and their activities, we will never know just how much they have spent in subsidizing the press, in subsidizing authors and play writers, in subsidizing college professors and teachers, and in subsidizing some preachers. But we already know something about the large sums of money spent by public utilities in subsidizing the above-mentioned molders of public opinion, thanks to the Federal Trade Commission. It disclosed Dr. C. A. Eaton's program.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret I cannot yield just now. I am sorry that I have not the time.

Mr. McFARLANE. I just wanted to ask if this gentleman is the Member of the House from New Jersey by that name.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no! It is not our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, but a General Electric Co. official.

#### THE THREE STARVELING PROFESSIONS

I invite my colleagues to get part no. 71A, embracing 486 printed pages, of the Report of the Federal Trade Commission on Utility Corporations regarding their efforts to influence public opinion, made to the United States Senate in 1934, and part no. 81A of said report, 570 pages, printed in 1935 as Senate Document 92, Seventieth Congress, first session, and they will be astounded at the revelations disclosed.

On page 149, of part no. 71A, you will find that Dr. C. A. Eaton, who was at that time both president of the American Educational Association, and also manager of the industrial relations of one of the departments of the General Electric Co., at the N. E. L. A. convention of 1924, said:

In this country we are supposed to be governed by ideas; we live by the art of thinking. The three institutions that deal in ideas are the school, the church, and the press, and those are the three institutions that we persist in starving to death.

Dr. Eaton then called the school, the church, and the press "the three starveling professions", and he suggested that public utilities employ them and supplement their meager incomes and let them spread the gospel of good will in behalf of utilities. He suggested that when vacation time came for utilities to employ teachers and pay them a salary to learn the public-utility business, and they would teach it to the school children better than utilities could do it themselves.

#### MILLIONS OF DOLLARS SPENT IN SUBSIDIZING

These reports disclose how utilities spent millions of dollars in subsidizing the press through increasing many, many times their columns of advertising matter carried in newspapers all over the United States.

These reports show how utilities spent millions of dollars making grants to universities, colleges, and schools throughout the United States and in paying salaries to numerous college professors and teachers, including Columbia University, Ohio State University, and scores of others scattered over the country. The Federal Trade Commission in such connection stated:

The activities of the public utilities in the schools were not based primarily upon any desire to aid in the general education of the youth of the country. Joe Carmichael, director of the Iowa committee on public-utility information, frankly admitted this in his testimony.

Commissioner McCullough asked Director Joe Carmichael the direct question: "The public utilities are going into the schools solely for the purpose of helping their business, aren't they?" and Director Carmichael frankly answered: "Yes."

These reports show that utilities even dared to go into the pulpits of our country and tried to subsidize some preachers by paying them salaries and honorariums for various services.

#### SUBSIDIZED UNIVERSITIES OF DR. CHARTERS, DR. COUNTS, AND DR. MERRIAM

From part 71-A, page 144, of said Federal Trade Commission's Report to the Senate on activities of utility corporations to subsidize universities, I quote the following from convention proceedings:

Mr. John C. Parker, chairman of the committee on educational institutions, said: "It has been felt wise to confine efforts to those aspects which affect most closely the economic and social relations of our industry. Much unsatisfactory work is being done in the schools through courses in political science in which supposed facts and false theories are being presented.

It was there shown that its 1928 committee included representatives from Columbia University, Chicago University, Ohio State University, University of Illinois, University of Washington, Michigan University, and University of Wisconsin.

#### ESTABLISHED PERSONAL CONTACT WITH EVERY UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE, NORMAL SCHOOL, AND JUNIOR COLLEGE

If you will look on page 150 of part 71-A of said report you will see that the Federal Trade Commission established the fact that public utilities arranged a personal contact with some teachers "in every university, college, normal school, and junior college in the United States" through putting such teachers on their pay roll in an attempt to mould and control public opinion.

#### THEN "ACADEMIC FREEDOM" BECAME THE HUE AND CRY

The John C. Parker committee on relationship with educational institutions which upon the suggestion of Samuel Insull and his brother, Martin Insull, was appointed in 1922, said that the universities must be very jealous of what is generally known as "academic freedom." That would help to ward off complaints and attacks. Chairman Sloan suggested the rewriting of school books. The committee warned that "Propagandists should be careful about rushing in where angels fear to tread", and for them "to conduct our newspaper publicity on the long-time basis." Chairman Gilchrist said: "We felt that the American people were exceedingly jealous of anything which was presented to the children in the schools, and would resent our attempt to use the medium of the schools." The committee said: "Work in the public schools must be done very carefully and tactfully to avoid attacks."

#### REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION MOST VALUABLE

This report of the Federal Trade Commission on subtle, secret activities of utilities to control public opinion embraces almost 100 volumes. Instead of being called "Volume No. 1", and so forth, they are called "Part No. 1", and so forth. They are most comprehensive. For instance, part 42 has 1,023 printed pages; part 43 has 859 printed pages; part 50 has 1,196 printed pages; part 55, has 869 printed pages; part 60 has 980 printed pages.

#### SUBSIDIZING GRANTS TO COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

You will find in part 25, part 35, part 51, part 64, part 71A, and part 81A the subsidizing grants made to Columbia University.



## SUBSIDIZING GRANTS TO CHICAGO UNIVERSITY

In part 42, part 60, part 71A, part 79, and part 81A you will find the subsidizing grants made to Chicago University.

## SUBSIDIZING GRANTS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

You will find in part 39, part 50, part 60, part 71A, and part 81A the subsidizing grants made to the University of Illinois.

## SUBSIDIZING GRANTS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

You will find in part 30, part 42, part 61, part 71A, and part 81A the subsidizing grants made to the University of Michigan.

## SUBSIDIZING GRANTS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

You will find in part 25, part 26, part 33, part 34, part 43, part 65, part 71A, and part 81A the subsidizing grants made to the University of Minnesota.

## SUBSIDIZING GRANTS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

In part 33, part 34, part 42, part 60, part 65, part 71A, and part 81A you will find the subsidizing grants made to the University of Wisconsin.

## SUBSIDIZING AUTHORS

In part 35, part 42, part 71A, and part 81A you will find how the public utilities were able to control the writings and books of authors.

## SUBSIDIZING NEWSPAPERS

I hope that every Member of this Congress will carefully read the many volumes, and especially part 81A, of this most interesting report of the Federal Trade Commission, and therein learn the numerous newspapers scattered over the United States that deliberately were subsidized by public utilities with increased so-called advertising to control their news and editorial columns on matters vitally affecting the public.

## THE WASHINGTON POST

Part 29, part 39, part 71A, part 78, and part 81A will show how the public utilities subsidized the Washington Post. If you will examine pages 543 and 544 of part 39, you will see the following check:

North American Light & Power Co., Chicago, September 13, 1927. Pay to the order of Washington Post, \$1,500. To the Central Trust Co. of Illinois, Chicago. Signed, North American Light & Power Co., by P. L. Smith, treasurer, and countersigned, R. W. Chase, cashier.

This check was endorsed on the back: "Pay to the order of American Security & Trust Co. of Washington, D. C., Washington Post Co.", and was cashed through the Riggs National Bank of Washington, D. C., on September 20, 1927.

On the books of the North American Light & Power Co., under date of October 4, 1927, there is a debit under "management expense" of \$1,500 paid to the Washington Post "for advertising." On page 544 of part 39 you will find how the Washington Post then proceeded to render value received for this \$1,500 by printing an editorial written in Chicago and a news item from Atlantic City, both furthering public-utilities activities.

## WHY DOES WASHINGTON POST NOW SUPPORT "REDS"?

Some answer that if the Washington Post would write \$1,500 editorials and news items for utilities, why would it not do it for "reds?" Both subsidizations are equally bad. Others say that the present owner of the Washington Post surely cannot believe in communism, for he has gotten immensely rich off of the Government. Others contend that he is the same kind of a Jew that Karl Marx was, and, instead of printing quotations from Karl Marx, he has employed Karl Schriftgiesser to fill the Washington Post with communistic mouthings. Some say he was "born a kike" and cannot ever be a high-class Jew.

Some of the finest men we have in Congress are Jews, who are Members of outstanding ability and who have the respect and confidence of their colleagues. They are not ashamed of being Jews. They are proud of their lineage. Some of my close lifelong friends are Jews, and I have no religious prejudice. But it is reported that this newspaperman is ashamed that he is a Jew, that he does not like to be called a Jew, and, excepting a few very rich, prominent, and influ-

LXXX—307

ential Jews whose favor he courts, he wants to associate only with Gentiles.

Regardless of the above, it is a fact that Eugene Meyer has employed Karl Schriftgiesser to write procommunistic news items and to publish unjust attacks in the Post upon Hon. George E. Sullivan, chairman of the special committee of the Federation of Citizens' Associations; upon Maj. Gen. Amos J. Fries, president of the District of Columbia Public School Association; upon the Daughters of the American Revolution; upon the American Legion, and myself, whom the Washington Post calls "the Nazi bloc", simply because we have been trying to eradicate communism from the Washington public schools.

## "SUCH DISLOYAL HORSEPLAY IS DISGRACEFUL"

A distinguished New York citizen writes:

This morning I received from a friend in Washington, clipping from the March 26 issue of the Washington Post, reporting the broadcast of the National Education Association over a coast-to-coast hook-up, and I am greatly surprised that President Aylesworth would allow such communistic propaganda to be sent out by the National Broadcasting Co. I have frequently remarked that the National Education Association broadcasts cannot continue 5 minutes before they turn decidedly "pink", although it disclaims furthering Marxism. It admits they broadcast propaganda in an attempt to repeal the law against teaching communism in schools, for in said broadcast it invited all listeners to—

"Write the National Education Association for further information on 'the little red rider' and important steps taken by Congress toward its repeal."

Concerning this Washington Post report by its editor, Karl Schriftgiesser, of said N. E. A. broadcast, this New York citizen said that "such disloyal horseplay is disgraceful."

The following is quoted from said Washington Post article referred to by said New York citizen:

[From the Washington Post of Mar. 26, 1936]

## RED RIDER ON RADIO

By Karl Schriftgiesser

## N. E. A. COMEDIANS AT WORK

The case of the little red rider, which not long ago was just a local issue, assumed Nation-wide status last night when it was kidded over a coast-to-coast hook-up known, aptly enough, as the red network of the National Broadcasting Co. All the key stations, I am told, were tuned in when, for a quarter of an hour, the comedians of the National Education Association turned on their pedantic wit upon the District's shame.

I do not know who was the author of the skit, The Little Red Rider, but I am sure he was not the fellow who did the continuity for the National Republic committee's series of electrical transcriptions broadcast over some of the minor stations awhile back. The N. E. A. broadcast rollicked through the absurdities of Washington life at a gay pace never attained by the elephantine micro-actors who, taking the part of Mary and John, were forced to live in sin because they could not afford to pay both taxes and the preacher and took the patriotic way.

Accompanied by lifting music, including the strains of "The International", the N. E. A. quarter hour told, with commendable accuracy, the history of the enactment and subsequent imposition of the educational gag law for the repeal of which Representative Fred Sisson is risking his political future in upper New York State. After explaining what the red rider is and how it came about, the radio skit shifts to a scene in the schoolroom:

Teacher: We have finished chapter 18. We will take chapter 20 tomorrow. Chapter 20 brings France down to the time of King Louis XIV. The court—

Mary: Teacher, aren't we going to study chapter 19 at all; this one about Russia?

Teacher: No, Mary—

Mary: But the papers and magazines are full about Russia.

Teacher: I'm sorry, Mary, but we can't study about Russia.

George: We did study about Russia—back here on page—

Henry: Sure we did. About the czars.

George: Yes; about Peter the Great—the one who used to crack down on people's heads with a cane when he was sore at 'em.

But the teacher is adamant. She will allow no discussion of Russia in her class. But that afternoon, when the kids are gedunking in the local sugar bowl, they get to talking about Russia and all decide to read the censored chapter. Just then a stranger enters bearing pamphlets. I gathered he was rather dirty, the stage character for the Bolshevik. Anyway, he gets talking to the young Nordics with the trace of a foreign accent and starts telling them what a great guy a fellow named Stalin is.

Well, the children don't think much of the stranger it seems, but they take his books and pamphlets and go read them behind General Fries' barn. Next Saturday finds them at a meeting of the Young Communists' League, listening to an orator—who isn't very well up on his Marx and who sounded just like a character out of Joe Palooka—telling them how the Red Army some day will enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.



I am sure that last night's program must have scared mothers and fathers from coast to coast. So perhaps they will do just what the NEA announcer then asked them to do, which is to petition Congress for the repeal of the little red rider, lest dirty strangers pass out pamphlets in ice-cream parlors the length and breadth of the land.

The National Education Association's broadcast was by far the most effective of several national efforts to aid the repeal of the "little red rider." Another, which has been widely mailed to teachers, is the current issue of the Journal of the Education Association of the District of Columbia.

The affair has now attained national attention, and if those now informed of the facts write or wire their Congressmen, even at the risk of being investigated by Senator BLACK, the resultant heat should smoke Congress into action behind Representative Sisson.

#### DESTRUCTION OF SEXUAL MORALITY ONE AIM OF COMMUNISM

Can Karl Schriftgiesser or Eugene Meyer give any explanation or excuse why, in reporting the above N. E. A. broadcast, used the expression:

Who, taking the part of Mary and John, were forced to live in sin because they could not afford to pay both taxes and preacher, and took the patriotic way.

They were scattering communistic propaganda. That is the only answer. You will find it almost daily in the Washington Post.

#### WHAT KIND OF PARENTS WANT DAUGHTERS TO READ THIS?

The Washington Post, Monday, March 30, 1936, on its front page under large headlines, Wants the Bare Facts About Nudist Job, carried the following article:

FORT MYERS, FLA., Mar. 29.—Pretty brunette Florence Fritz, first applicant for the job of stenographer for a Tampa nudist society, told her prospective boss she "could not conceive of an intelligent secretary in the nude, working on a typewriter." She added, however, she was willing to be convinced.

Declaring in her letter she was maintaining an open mind on nudism, the tall, comely business girl wrote to the leader of the American Gymnosophical Society as follows:

"DEAR BROTHER SOSHINSKI: I should particularly like to know if it is mandatory upon the members to go in the nude, as I cannot conceive of an intelligent secretary, in the nude, working on a typewriter, but I am willing to be convinced and shall await your answer."

#### ENDEAVORING TO MAKE YOUNG GIRLS THINK SUCH PRACTICES ALL RIGHT

The Washington Post again on Wednesday, April 1, 1936, under big headlines, Typist for Nudists Starts on Duties, carried the following:

TAMPA, FLA., Mar. 31.—Helene Hardy today was a full-fledged nudist stenographer under the shade of a moss-laden oak tree on the shore of Lake Thonotassa, with nature's raiment as her "office dress."

A typewriter mounted on a table in the wide out-of-doors constituted the office furniture for the slender, 25-year-old brunette. She was an employee and nudist member of the American Gymnosophical Association, which means "nudist colony" in practical application.

Some days ago Herman Soshinski, director of the nudist group at Lake Thonotassa, advertised for a stenographer who would subscribe to the nudist ideas. Yesterday he found 60 young women applying for the one job he had to offer.

#### TIME MARCHES ON

A dozen years ago an attempt was made to have the Government spend \$60,000,000 to build a power plant at Great Falls. Mr. Fred Zihlman, later chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, who was trying to put the bill across, claimed that it would cost only \$44,421,000, but in the extensive hearings I proved conclusively that it would cost as much as \$60,000,000, and most probably \$80,000,000. I fought it for 2 years, and when the committee reported it favorably, I filed in the House on February 5, 1925, a 25-page minority report against it, being Report 1247, part 2, Sixty-eighth Congress, second session, and we finally succeeded in killing it. I contended all along that the big utilities were behind it, but at that time I could not get the positive proof.

All of the Washington newspapers were fighting for it daily, and published many vicious articles against me for opposing it. At last the Federal Trade Commission has furnished the proof. On page 428 of part 65 of the said Federal Trade Commission's report on utilities, you will find the following two very interesting letters:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 9, 1924.

Mr. A. W. FLOR,  
Electric Bond & Share Co., New York.

DEAR MR. FLOR: I thought it advisable, as long as you are specially interested in this development of Great Falls project, to look into it further today. The bill was introduced on the House

side by Mr. Zihlman of Maryland, and hearings began on that bill today before a subcommittee of the District of Columbia of the House. I enclose you a copy of the Zihlman bill, as well as extracts from the Washington papers. These hearings will be extensively reported in the local papers, and I will send the clippings to you each night.

As I pointed out to you on the telephone yesterday, the present difficulty with these bills is that they do not make any appropriation; they are merely authorizations. I remember that it was the intention to add an appropriation to the Army appropriation bill, but that bill has passed the House long ago, and I presume, if it is the intention really to begin work on this project, it will be necessary to get an appropriation in a deficiency bill.

The classic document on the whole situation, as I remember it, is the so-called Tyler report. That is out of print, but if I am not mistaken I have a copy of it in my library at home, and will try to send it to you.

Yours sincerely,

WINGROVE BATHON.

#### WAS ELECTRIC BOND & SHARE CO. RUNNING CONGRESS?

Who gave its lobbyist authority to speak with such assurance? How did he know that the hearings would be extensively reported each day in all the Washington newspapers? Were bills prepared and introduced according to their intentions? Could they at will put \$44,000,000 items in the Army appropriation bill? Could they at will put \$44,000,000 items in deficiency bills?

#### STORIES WILL BE SPECIALIZED IN WASHINGTON NEWSPAPERS

The following is the reply of the Electric Bond & Share Co. to its lobbyist:

NEW YORK, May 10, 1924.

Mr. WINGROVE BATHON,

National Savings and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BATHON: Your letter of yesterday with reference to the Great Falls situation has just arrived. It serves Mr. Silliman's purpose very well, and we thank you for it. The New York papers will probably give but little, if any, mention to the hearings now in progress on this matter. The stories will probably be "specialized", more or less, in the Washington papers, and any clippings from those papers therefore, will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

A. W. FLOR.

#### HEARINGS EMBRACED 242 PRINTED PAGES

If my colleagues will look on page 207 they will see that I proved by an expert engineer that even if the Government spent \$100,000,000 on this project, it would not give the people any benefit, or anything more than they then had. As this scheme is still slumbering, it may be worth while to quote a few paragraphs from the hearings:

Mr. BLANTON. There is no use of creating a tremendous power by reservoirs and dams unless you can use it advantageously?

Major O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. The estimated cost is a total of \$44,421,000. It could be that this project could cost 50 percent more? Might not that occur?

Major O'CONNOR. Well, of course, we cannot say.

Mr. BLANTON. There is an expert engineer here in Washington who claims that this might cost \$80,000,000.

Major O'CONNOR. Well, that is a kind of hard question to answer.

Mr. BLANTON. The Potomac Electric Power Co. owns this site at Great Falls?

Major O'CONNOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. It paid \$400,000 for it?

Major O'CONNOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And immediately after paying \$400,000 it entered it up on its books as worth \$1,000,000?

Major O'CONNOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And it would probably ask the United States Government \$1,000,000 for it or more?

Major O'CONNOR. Yes; it is fair to assume that.

Mr. BLANTON. And possibly more?

Major O'CONNOR. Well, I do not know—yes, sir.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Will you please state your name and occupation?

Mr. LEIGHTON. M. O. Leighton; I am a water-power engineer.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Located at New York?

Mr. LEIGHTON. At present, yes; although my legal domicile is in Washington, and I have lived here for 22 years and have an office in Washington.

Mr. BLANTON. You are familiar, of course, with the country surrounding this entire site, from Great Falls down to Chain Bridge?

Mr. LEIGHTON. Oh, yes. I have almost crawled over it on my hands and knees.

Mr. BLANTON. Your total figures are \$57,700,000 against the Tyler report of \$44,421,000?

Mr. LEIGHTON. Yes; 30 percent more.

Mr. BLANTON. You would say as an expert engineer that to be safe for your client if you were passing on this project as a fea-



ible undertaking, you would recommend that they not undertake this for less than \$60,000,000.

Mr. LEIGHTON. I would advise financing on that basis.

Question. What do you mean by your organization?

Answer. The Electric Bond & Share Co.

Question. You are connected with them?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you are one of the engineers?

Answer. I am one of the boys.

Question. How many engineers have you, more than one?

Answer. Oh, I think all together we have about 1,500.

Question. I misunderstood you. Is this a corporation you are speaking of?

Answer. Yes; a management and construction corporation.

Question. If it has 1,500 engineers, it must be the largest in the country, then.

Answer. It is of that type. The properties that are operated and managed by that corporation supply a population of about 8,000,000 people.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the highest salary the Potomac Electric Power Co. pays?

Mr. HAM. \$15,000.

Mr. BLANTON. This is to the president?

Mr. HAM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the highest salary that the Washington Railway & Electric Co. pays?

Mr. HAM. \$10,000 to the same president.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the two companies pay \$25,000 to one man?

Mr. HAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And the two companies are really owned by one company?

Mr. HAM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Same stockholders?

Mr. HAM. All the stock of the Potomac Electric Power Co. is owned by the Washington Railway & Electric Co.

Mr. BLANTON. How many subsidiary companies are there that are owned by these two companies or either of them?

Mr. HAM. Eight or ten.

Mr. BLANTON. Are you the president of all of them?

Mr. HAM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. You are president of 8 or 10 subsidiary companies?

Mr. HAM. Yes.

Mr. Ham showed that his railway-power company here was paying him \$25,000, his vice president \$12,000, his comptroller \$7,500, his manager \$7,000, his secretary \$6,000, one attorney \$6,000, another attorney \$5,500, and his engineer \$5,500, salaries per annum.

#### COMMUNISTS COMMUNIZE TEACHERS; THEN TEACHERS GET FUNDS FROM FOUNDATIONS

The Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., of New York City, one of its directors being Hon. Newton D. Baker, former Secretary of War, in reporting its investigations of American foundations, in its booklet published in 1931 entitled "American Foundations and Their Fields", named the 20 largest foundations, and stated that gifts had been given in support of institutions or projects concerned with what are usually known as the social sciences. I quote from it the following:

#### The twenty largest foundations

Rank.	Name	Capital
1	Carnegie Corporation of New York	\$159,860,783
2	Rockefeller Foundation	147,373,921
3	General Education Board	93,936,152
4	Duke Endowment	50,000,000
5	Commonwealth Fund	42,950,712
6	Carnegie Institution of Washington	33,714,249
7	Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching	31,533,177
8	Altman Foundation	30,000,000
9	Russell Sage Foundation	15,000,000
10	M. and L. Guggenheim Foundation	14,140,000
11	Julius Rosenwald Fund	13,711,295
12	Buhl Foundation	12,483,151
13	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	12,084,419
14	Juilliard Musical Foundation	12,000,000
15	Milbank Memorial Fund	10,702,093
16	Children's Fund of Michigan	10,093,113
17	Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation	10,000,000
18	Spelman Fund	9,452,397
19	New York Community Trust	8,672,382
20	Cranbrook Foundation	7,846,985

Total of 20 largest foundations..... 725,559,829

#### "RED" UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS HAVE MISUSED ABOVE FUNDS

Without disclosing or having their intentions known, some subversive organizations and "red" university professors have been getting large grants from the above foundations, which they have used in trying to communize the universities, col-

leges, and schools of the United States. Large sums have been paid to influence teachers. Large sums have been paid to influence some preachers. Large sums have been paid to influence authors to write books of communistic propaganda. Large sums have been paid to newspapers to give publicity to communistic propaganda.

#### THE COMMISSION ON THE SOCIAL STUDIES

On page vii of the preface of his A Charter for the Social Sciences (a product from said commission), Dr. Charles A. Beard tells us how the commission on the social studies was appointed and financed. I quote:

The council of the American Historical Association was now asked to sponsor this undertaking. The authorities of the Commonwealth fund expressed an interest in the proposal and appropriated a sum to cover the preparation of a definite plan for such investigation.

In the fall of 1927 the Carnegie Corporation made an appropriation to permit the recasting of this plan into "working drawings." At the annual meeting of the American Historical Association held in Washington, D. C., December 1928, it was announced that the Carnegie Corporation had appropriated the funds (\$300,000) necessary to undertake the investigation. The council at the same time nominated the personnel of the commission to direct this investigation. The commission began its work in January 1929. The commission will end its work in December 1933.

#### WORKED TOGETHER 5 YEARS ON PLAN TO COMMUNIZE SCHOOLS

The commission on the social studies, which worked together 5 years, beginning in January 1929 and ending in December 1933, is so very important regarding the attempted indoctrination of communism in the Washington public schools, that I want my colleagues to watch closely how their subtle scheme slowly unfolds like a magnolia bud. When this commission was first appointed among its members were Dr. Frank W. Ballou, Superintendent of Schools, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Charles A. Beard, formerly professor of politics, Columbia University; Ada Comstock, president of Radcliffe College; Dr. George S. Counts, professor Teachers College, Columbia University; Carleton J. H. Hayes, professor, Columbia University; and Charles E. Merriam, professor, Chicago University.

Since on page x of the preface to his Charter for the Social Sciences, Dr. Charles A. Beard states that on a subcommittee for the consideration of objectives, Dr. Harold O. Rugg was appointed, I add his name to the list, he being one of the editors of the communistic magazine Scholastic. And since Dr. W. W. Charters is mentioned by the commission in its final conclusions as having rendered to them very great assistance, I add his name to the list, he being the president of the Ohio University, and the one Dr. Ballou thereafter selected and placed in charge of character education to guide in the Washington schools. For 5 years Dr. Frank W. Ballou was secretary for the said commission on the social studies. He was the chairman of one of its important committees. And since Dr. Ballou selected Dr. Charles R. Mann to assist Dr. W. W. Charters in putting over his misnamed character education on the unsuspecting school children of Washington, we will now see how many of the above intimate workers and collaborators of Dr. Ballou are radicals and have their names in the Communist Who's Who.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry; I cannot. I have not the time.

#### IS IT NOT STRANGE THAT ALL OF THE ABOVE ARE RADICALS?

I will now quote from Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling's The Red Network, a Who's Who of Radicalism, giving the names and background of the radicals—Dr. Ballou's close associates—who belong to communistic organizations in the United States:

#### DR. CHARLES A. BEARD, "RADICAL"

The Red Network, in its Who's Who in Radicalism, embraces Dr. Charles A. Beard "a college professor", and states that—

He is a supporter of the radical Rand School.

#### ADA COMSTOCK, "RADICAL"

The Red Network, in its Who's Who in Radicalism, embraces Ada Comstock, described as—



President of Radcliffe College; a member of the National Citizens Committee on Relations with Latin America, echoing the communistic A. A. A. I.; member of Open Road and an affiliate of communistic Intourist (Soviet Government travel agency), the V. O. K. S.; and signer of petition for Russian recognition.

DR. GEORGE S. COUNTS, "RADICAL"

The Red Network, in its Who's Who in Radicalism, embraces Dr. George S. Counts, described as—

Professor, Teachers' College, Columbia University, showing membership in, and relationship to, and author of, various communistic organizations and communistic books.

Which require about one-fourth of a column to list all of same.

CARLETON J. H. HAYES, "RADICAL"

The Red Network, in its Who's Who in Radicalism, embraces Carleton J. H. Hayes, described as—

Professor, Columbia University, showing membership in, and relationship to, and author of, various communistic organizations and communistic books.

Which require about one-fourth of a column to list all of same, and says that—

At a meeting of the Communists on militarism in education he sneered at patriotic observances and at respect of Old Glory and the Liberty Bell, which he called "the religion of nationalism" and the "cult for worship of the flag."

Capt. George L. Darte at that time described Hayes as "one who raises the 'red' flag in time of peace and the 'white' flag in time of war."

CHARLES E. MERRIAM, "RADICAL"

The Red Network, in its Who's Who in Radicalism, embraces Charles E. Merriam, described as—

Professor, University of Chicago, showing membership in, and relationship to, and author of, various communistic organizations and communistic books.

Which require about one-fourth of a column to list all of same, and states:

In the University of Chicago Daily Maroon, May 17, 1933, he referred to the proposed Baker bills to prevent teaching of sedition in the Illinois schools as "another monkey law."

DR. HAROLD O. RUGG, "RADICAL"

The Red Network, in its Who's Who in Radicalism, embraces Harold Rugg, described as—

Professor, Columbia University. His growing pro-Soviet eulogies are quoted at length in the communistic Daily Worker, which, on December 5, 1933, quoted from one of Harold Rugg's speeches the following:

"Today 6,000,000 young Russians in the Communist Youth Organization are making a fine, constructive contribution to the construction of a new social order."

Harold Rugg's reference is to the Russian Comsomols (Young Communist League), which are building for world bloody class hate and revolution, destruction of religion and family life.

DR. CHARLES R. MANN, "RADICAL"; DR. W. W. CHARTERS, "RADICAL"; DR. STEPHEN DUGGAN, "RADICAL"; DR. JOHN DEWEY, "RADICAL"

In her book *The Red Network*, a who's who of radicalism, on page 255, Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling calls attention to the printed announcements of the Moscow University in Russia for its summer school of 1934, made through the Anglo-American Institute of the First Moscow University, announcing a Communist summer school in Moscow, Russia, conducted in conjunction with American educators, from which I quote the following:

The Anglo-American Institute will offer at the First Moscow University, during the summer of 1934, a variety of courses as a means of furthering cultural contacts between American and Russian teachers and students. All instruction is in English, under the direction of a faculty of Soviet professors and specialists, with an advisory staff of American instructors. Moscow University certifies academic credit for foreign students.

National advisory council [embraces]: W. W. Charters, Ohio State University; George S. Counts, Teachers College, Columbia University; John Dewey, Columbia University; Stephen Duggan, director, Institute of International Education; Charles H. Judd, dean, University of Chicago; I. L. Kandel, Teachers College, Columbia University; Charles R. Mann, director, A. C. on E.; William F. Russell, dean, Teachers College, Columbia University.

OVER 200 UNITED STATES TEACHERS AND STUDENTS ATTENDED MOSCOW UNIVERSITY, RUSSIA, IN 1934

You will note that excluding Stephen Duggan, who helped them organize it, Dr. W. W. Charters, of Ohio University; Dr. Charles H. Judd, of Chicago University; and Dr. Charles R. Mann, the other above-mentioned organizers of this Mos-

cow, Russia, training for American teachers, all hail from the Columbia University. They pronounced their first summer session in Moscow, Russia, in 1934, as a success. Over 200 teachers and students from the United States attended. I quote from the Washington Star, August 16, 1934, under big headlines, Americans Finish Moscow Studies, and with sub-headlines that A Majority of the 200 United States Students and Professors Are Believers, the following news item sent by special cable:

Moscow, August 15, 1934.—The first intensive session of the Anglo-American Institute of the first Moscow University conducted here closed last night. Examinations over, the student body, composed of 200 American students, teachers, and professors from the principal colleges and universities of the United States, left Moscow tonight. Explained Professor Pinkevich, we are carefully studying the experiences of capitalistic countries like the United States. We believe the time has come when America has something to learn from us.

Among the student body are 57 with the degree of B. A., 40 with M. A., 11 with Ph. D., and 7 with M. D. The great majority are ardent believers in the Soviet program. The institute grew out of the experiment conducted here last summer by Irving V. Sollins, formerly a New York teacher, member of the Anglo-American Institute, now in the employ of the first Moscow University.

DR. CHARTERS IN SYMPATHY WITH DR. DUGGAN

In a telegram sent by him to the Washington Herald on February 20, 1935, Dr. W. W. Charters said:

I satisfied myself about summer school University of Moscow where American travelers would get more accurate picture of Soviet educational system.

And Dr. Charters admits that he received a letter from Dr. Stephen Duggan stating:

The recognition of Russia by the United States Government removes the last barrier to complete cultural cooperation between Russia and the United States. There has already been founded the Anglo-American Institute of the First Moscow University. . . .

The Anglo-American Institute will next year have a summer session at the First Moscow University, at which courses will be given in English, primarily for teachers and students. A bulletin will be issued shortly descriptive of these courses.

My object in writing you now is to inform you that I am organizing an advisory council to assist . . . the Anglo-American Institute. I am hoping that you are in sympathy with the purpose of the activity, and if so, that you will be willing to serve on the advisory council.

And Dr. W. W. Charters admits that he replied, and accepted, and furnishes his reply, which is as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, December 13, 1933.

DR. STEPHEN DUGGAN,  
Institute of International Education, Inc.,  
2 West Forty-fifth Street, New York City.

DEAR DR. DUGGAN: I shall be glad to serve as a member of your advisory council.

Very cordially yours,

W. W. CHARTERS.

"OF MOSCOW." DR. W. W. CHARTERS WAS "IN SYMPATHY"

Please remember that in Dr. Stephen Duggan's letter to Dr. Charters he said: "The Anglo-American Institute of the First Moscow University." It was "of Moscow" and not "of United States." And Duggan said: "I am hoping that you are in sympathy." And Dr. W. W. Charters was "in sympathy", for without hesitation he said: "I shall be glad to serve." He cannot now hide behind the flimsy excuse that he "has never been in Russia." He did not have to go to Russia to do damage. What he did here, did do damage, for he allowed his name to head the list of the "advisory council" on all of the literature immediately gotten out by the Moscow University, in Russia, to induce American professors and students to attend this summer session of 1934 in Moscow, and was responsible for the indoctrination of 200 teachers and students from the United States with soviet poison, for remember the Washington Star on August 16, 1934, stated that: "The great majority of them left Russia ardent believers in the soviet program." Dr. W. W. Charters is responsible.

The name W. W. Charters stands at the top of the list of the "advisory council" on all of the literature and advertisements of this Moscow University. Then following his name are: George S. Counts, John Dewey, Stephen Duggan, Charles H. Judd, I. L. Kandel, Charles R. Mann, and a lot of other communistic sympathizers and promoters.



## MOSCOW PROSPECTUS FOR SUMMER SCHOOL OF 1935

On the very elaborate prospectus gotten out by the Moscow University for its succeeding summer school of 1935 all of the above names appeared as the "advisory council": W. W. Charters, George S. Counts, John Dewey, Stephens Duggan, Charles H. Judd, I. L. Kandel, and Charles R. Mann. With Dr. W. W. Charters heading the list, all of their names appeared on all of the extensive advertising matter, documents, and letterheads gotten out by the Moscow University for its summer school of 1935, with "Moscow University" at the top of them all.

## APPEALING LETTER URGING ATTENDANCE

On April 27, 1935, an appealing letter (no. 2) was prepared and mailed to college professors and teachers over the United States, on letterhead of "Moscow State University Summer Session", and this letterhead embraced the names of W. W. Charters, George S. Counts, John Dewey, Stephen Duggan, Charles H. Judd, I. L. Kandel, and Charles R. Mann as the advisory council, from one of which such letters I quote:

You have previously received our letter, together with information concerning attendance at the Moscow University summer school. Do you at this time need additional information or assistance in completing your school enrollment or travel arrangements?

The 1934 session of the Moscow summer school enrolled American students 100 percent in excess of our expectations. For 1935 we have decided to limit enrollment to 500 students. This quota is rapidly being filled. While registrations are accepted as late as June, it is advisable to enroll early in order to avoid the necessity of paying cable fees to secure soviet visa.

There is no age limit or professional requirement for attendance at the Moscow University summer school. Its student body has one common characteristic—a sincere interest in studying the various trends and aspects of the new life in the Soviet Union. The applications we now have are from professors, social workers, physicians, college students, teachers, and school administrators. Will you kindly fill out the enclosed prepaid post card?

## PROPOSED 1935 SUMMER SCHOOL MET OBSTACLES

With the above letter was sent to each of said teachers and students solicited to attend the Moscow University 1935 summer school a list of 24 books on communistic propaganda by such "red" authors as Stalin, Yakovlev, Lenin, Pokrovsky, Grinko, Semashko, and George S. Counts.

Note that such letter was the second one written urging enrollment. All of such letters carried on the letterheads the names of Dr. W. W. Charters and Dr. Charles R. Mann. Is it not almost incomprehensible that they, Dr. W. W. Charters and Dr. Charles R. Mann, were selected by Dr. Frank W. Ballou and the Board of Education to be placed in charge of character education in the Washington schools? Why were they, of all others, selected? Was it premeditated? Was it accidental? Did it just so happen? Or was it carefully and studiously planned, mapped out, arranged, and executed through preconcert? Remember what Abraham Lincoln said about "preconcert." I will shortly convince you that it was hatched in the "commission on the social studies" during the 5 years that Dr. Ballou, Dr. Counts, Dr. Beard, and Dr. Charters were working together preparing their "conclusions" on their "new philosophy" and their "new social order."

The main thing that queered and stopped the Moscow University 1935 summer school, at which the said letter written by Dr. W. W. Charters and Dr. Charles R. Mann's "council" announced they would have 500 American college professors and teachers enrolled, was that, following the hearings our subcommittee conducted in December 1934, wherein Dr. Ballou had testified that what he was trying to do was "to establish a new philosophy of education", and that it was necessary for him "to change fundamentally the philosophy of education of his 2,900 teachers" before he could have character education in his schools, the reason for the action of our subcommittee in refusing to allow Dr. Ballou his requested \$87,540 as a second annual appropriation for character education was told here and there and published here and there, until the "fear of God" was put into the hearts of many teachers and they refused to enroll, and the Moscow University learned that their plan of "indoctrinating American teachers" had been found out; so it

got cold feet as it learned that many good Americans were demanding that our recognition of Russia be withdrawn and that we cease to recognize Russia, so that knocked into a cocked hat Russia's Moscow University 1935 summer school.

## SOME OF DR. BALLOU'S ADMISSIONS

Regarding this proposed Moscow University 1935 summer session that was called off and not held, I quote the following from our hearings:

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, have you ever seen the printed prospectus of the 1935 summer course of the Moscow University?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. That has been shown all over the United States?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Trying to get teachers and students to come there and take the summer course in Moscow, Russia?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Have you got one of those prospectuses?

Dr. BALLOU. I have one in my office.

Mr. BLANTON. Would you mind sending it to us?

Mr. BALLOU. I would be glad to exhibit it to you. I have only one copy.

Mr. BLANTON. Will you exhibit it to us in the morning?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. You will kindly bring it to us in the morning. Thank you very much.

Dr. BALLOU. Now, two things: At the head of that advisory committee, on that same page which I have in my mind, and which I will exhibit to you tomorrow morning, are the names of Dr. George S. Counts and Dr. Heber Harper, who were to teach in Moscow University and they were so designated as teachers in Moscow University. But the others, the advisory committee, made up of President Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, Dr. Charles R. Mann, of the American Council on Education, and a large number of other leading American educators—that pamphlet does not show that they were teaching or intending to teach in that university.

Mr. BLANTON. But it was intended that he, George S. Counts, was to teach?

Dr. BALLOU. He was listed as one of the teachers.

Mr. JOHNSON. Who is Dr. Duggan?

Dr. BALLOU. Dr. Duggan is director of this institute which has charge of this program, and is the one who organized this advisory committee and selected it himself, this advisory committee to which the chairman of the committee has referred, and on which advisory committee Dr. W. W. Charter's name appears.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, right there, is it not a fact that Moscow University abandoned its 1935 summer course because there was a lot of criticism raised in the United States against this institute, and the institute withdrew its support of this program? Isn't that a fact?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know it to be a fact, sir, but that is according to my information.

Mr. JOHNSON. The withdrawal came just before the summer session began.

Mr. BLANTON. How did the withdrawal come to be made?

Dr. BALLOU. The University of Moscow authorities did not make any satisfactory explanation for their withdrawal of the faculty from Moscow University which was supposed to offer instruction to students of American and English institutions. That is according to Dr. Duggan's statement in a letter on that subject.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you know what instruction they proposed to give them at Moscow University?

Dr. BALLOU. A complete program of the summer course was listed in this circular to which the chairman has previously referred.

## DR. BALLOU WAS NOT IGNORANT OF THE SITUATION

Dr. Ballou's Board of Education claimed that none of its members knew of Dr. Charters' and of Dr. Charles R. Mann's connection with the Moscow University summer schools. But Dr. Ballou himself knew all about it. He knew that their names appeared on all of the advertising literature and on all of the prospectuses, and that they were allowing their names, scattered broadcast over the United States, to induce college professors and public-school teachers to enroll in Moscow University. It was just as reprehensible for Dr. Charters to "pimp" in the United States for Moscow University in helping to send it the victims as it was for Dr. George S. Counts to "pimp" for Moscow University in helping to indoctrinate the victims after they reached Russia.

## FROM DR. BALLOU'S OWN PRIVATE COPY

Are you aware, Doctor, that this same George S. Counts is likewise listed in that printed volume of the Moscow State University that I asked you to present to the committee this morning?

Dr. BALLOU. I am, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you bring that with you?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Will you let me have it, please?

Dr. BALLOU. I thought that you would perhaps give me the privilege of presenting the material which the committee asked me to present yesterday. This is the only copy that I have.

Mr. BLANTON. We shall give this back to you, Doctor.



This copy which I get from Dr. Frank W. Ballou has on the front page of it the following:

"Moscow State University, summer session (Anglo-American section), 1935, July 16 to August 25, Moscow, U. S. S. R.; American Representative, Intourist, Inc., educational department, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y."

On the first inside page I read as follows:

"Moscow University—SUMMER SESSION  
"(Anglo-American Section)

"American Advisory Organization: Institute of International Education, Inc. Advisers: George S. Counts and Heber Harper

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

"W. W. Charters, director, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University.

"Harry Woodburn Chase, chancellor of New York University.

"George S. Counts, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

"John Dewey, professor emeritus of philosophy, Columbia University.

"Stephen Duggan, director, Institute of International Education.

"Charles H. Judd, dean, School of Education, University of Chicago.

"I. L. Kandel, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

"Charles R. Mann, director, American Council on Education.

"William F. Russell, dean, Teachers College, Columbia University.

"H. W. Tyler, general secretary, American Association of University Professors.

"The tremendous progress of the Soviet Union in the cultural field creates for Americans an unequalled observation ground for education, psychology, and the social sciences. The Soviet Union presents a unique opportunity for the study of the processes of cultural change. The first and second 5-year plans, by creating the foundations of a planned national economy, have brought about a complete reconstruction in the social attitudes and behavior of the Russian people.

"From a backward and illiterate country, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has been transformed into a modern industrial nation. Illiteracy has been almost abolished. The Soviet Union possesses the most progressive system of public education, extensively making use of the best achievements of international pedagogy. Soviet policy in social welfare, the care of mothers and children, the reeducation and redirection of lawless elements, and in other fields, presents a provocative challenge to students on all levels.

#### "PURPOSE

"Moscow University summer session conducts an Anglo-American section, open to all academically qualified foreigners who are interested in the cultural and educational aspects of life in the Soviet Union. Instruction is in the English language by an all-Soviet faculty of professors and specialists. The State University of Moscow certifies academic credit to those foreign students meeting the requirements of the university and completing a course of study in its Anglo-American section. The director of the Moscow University summer session is a Soviet educator. The summer session is officially an organizational part of the Moscow State University.

"To facilitate still closer rapprochement, each year several American educators are invited to Moscow as resident advisers to the summer session. Dr. George S. Counts and Dr. Heber Harper, professors of education, Teachers College, Columbia University, will act as advisers during the summer session of 1935.

"The Moscow University summer session is sponsored in the Soviet Union by the Peoples' Commissariat of Education of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republics; by VOKS, the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries; and by Intourist, the state travel company of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Intourist, through its educational department, will supply information to persons interested.

"Moscow University will offer, in its Anglo-American section, during the summer of 1935 a variety of courses to serve as a means of furthering cultural contacts between American and Russian teachers and students.

"An elementary course, presenting and describing the basic ideas and institutions of Soviet society. Beginning with a brief historical account, the course will present in simple terms the theory and practice of socialist construction. Among the topics included in the course are: The theories underlying the Soviet state; the organization of the government and the Soviet economy; the program of educational and cultural advance; the relation of the individual to the family and to other social groups; the question of the village and the collectivization of agriculture; and the solution of the problem of national minorities. The course is intended as a general survey of Soviet life.

#### ACADEMIC CREDIT

"The Moscow University summer session certifies foreign students for full academic credit at the University of Moscow. The student may offer the certificate of attendance and credit issued by the University of Moscow to the faculty of the American college or university at which he is regularly enrolled for evaluation and recognition in accordance with the policies and procedures of the institution. In order to assist in the evaluation of credit, the director of the Moscow University summer session will provide the dean, faculty adviser, or other administrative official with a full academic description of courses and of the progress in work of each

student. The minimum university credit possible is two points and the maximum is six points (semester units).

"New York City school teachers may offer the certificates issued by the University of Moscow to meet the requirements for annual salary increment (alertness credit)."

#### COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS ON MOSCOW PAY ROLL

You will note that Moscow University advertised that Dr. George S. Counts and Dr. Heber Harper, of Teachers College, Columbia University, would teach in Moscow.

#### DR. FRANK W. BALLOU FOOLED WASHINGTON

The Washington Herald, June 26, 1935, under big headlines "Schools begin experiment in new teaching" said:

Under the leadership of three distinguished authorities on education the cogs of the District's far-flung character-education experiment was formally set in motion yesterday.

It will be in charge of Dr. W. W. Charters, of Ohio State University, Dr. Ben D. Wood, of Columbia University, and Dr. Charles R. Mann, director of the American Council on Education.

All three have been retained by the Board of Education as consultants, and will be paid \$50 a day.

It was first endorsed as a necessary addition to school curriculum by Dr. Frank W. Ballou, after Senator COPELAND, of New York, had gathered startling facts through his Senate Crime Committee.

W. W. Charters and Charles R. Mann are in "Red Network" as radicals, connected with the Moscow University, and Ben D. Wood assisted Counts and Beard's "Commission."

#### DID THE SENATE CRIME COMMITTEE START IT? LET'S SEE!

In his New York speech, November 1, 1934, titled "The Washington Experiment in Character Education", Dr. Frank W. Ballou said:

The character-education experiment which we are inaugurating in Washington owes its inception to Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND, of New York, and \* \* \* grew out of the investigation of crime conducted by a committee of the United States Senate." (Hearings, p. 523, December 1934.)

DR. CHARTERS SAID IN OCTOBER 1934 IT WAS RESULT OF 5 YEARS' STUDY BY DR. BALLOU AND HIS TEACHING CORPS

In his article entitled "The COPELAND Experiment in the District of Columbia" in the October 1934 issue of the Educational Record, published by the American Council on Education, Dr. W. W. Charters, who was its chosen guide, said:

Washington was selected for this study partly because it was a convenient location, partly because Dr. Frank W. Ballou and the Board of Education are enthusiastic about the project, and partly because the teaching corps of the city has been working upon the problem for the last 5 years.

When Dr. Charters said, "Washington was selected for this study partly because it was a convenient location", that meant that outsiders did the selecting. Somebody outside of Washington selected Washington because it was convenient to them. When Dr. Charters said that it was because Dr. Ballou and his teaching corps had been working "for the last 5 years" on this "experiment", or "project", or "study", by all of which three names he called it within 1 minute of time, he did not realize that that "5 years", before October 1934, was the same "5 years" that he has been of such great assistance to Dr. Frank W. Ballou, Dr. George S. Counts, and Dr. Charles A. Beard while they were at work on the \$300,000 Commission on the Social Studies."

DR. BALLOU HAD WORKED 5 YEARS ON IT, BUT HIS CORPS OF TEACHERS HAD NOT

From our hearings, page 553, I will quote Dr. Ballou's testimony showing that when called on for the names he could not name but one teacher out of his entire corps of over 2,900 that he would say had been working on "character education", and that was Miss Backus, whom he transferred to it with a big raise in salary, and finally he admitted that his corps of teachers had not worked 5 years on it.

Mr. BLANTON. Have you read the article by W. W. Charters entitled "The Copeland Experiment in the District of Columbia", carried in the October 1934 issue of the Educational Record, published by the American Council on Education, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., in which article the following statements are made, and I quote them from page 404:

"Washington was selected for this study, partly because it was a convenient location, partly because Dr. Frank W. Ballou and the Board of Education are enthusiastic about the project, and partly because the teaching corps of the city has been working upon the problem for the last 5 years."



Dr. BALLOU. I have read that article; yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the teaching corps of this city, prior to October 1934, had been working on this problem for 5 years?

Dr. BALLOU. Certainly, and many teachers have been working on it for 25 years, or all their lives. He quoted the last 5 years. There was a special committee of officers and teachers appointed to consider the matter, to consider what we might do about improving the character of the boys and girls in our schools.

Mr. JOHNSON. You mean here in Washington?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes; in Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON. In the city of Washington?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. Who appointed that committee?

Dr. BALLOU. The committee was appointed by me, and it was approved by the Board.

Mr. BLANTON. Note the language. He says:

"Partly because (you) 'Dr. Ballou', and the Board of Education in Washington are enthusiastic about the project, and partly because the teaching corps of the city has been working upon the problem for the last 5 years."

Dr. BALLOU. What is there about that that is of any special interest?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, did you ever apprise Congress of the fact that you had a corps of teachers working on a 5-year program on this matter before when you came here and asked for the \$63,000 for character education?

Dr. BALLOU. There are lots of committees in the District schools that are working on various projects that have not been brought to the attention of Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. Can you give us the names of five of the most prominent members of the teaching corps in the city of Washington who were collaborating with you for 5 years before October 1934 on that problem?

Dr. BALLOU. I will submit that for the record. I cannot remember the names of those persons except Miss Backus, who is now in charge of the experiment, was chairman of that committee.

Mr. BLANTON. You can remember Miss Backus. How about Mr. George Jones? Can you remember any others offhand who were helping you on that 5-year program?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know that Mr. George Jones was on that committee. He may have been. I do not know that he was.

Mr. BLANTON. Your Mr. George Jones was mentioned in that conclusions and recommendations of your commission, for which you was secretary for 5 years.

Mr. JOHNSON. Doctor, how could you work 5 years on a thing of this sort and not know who the members of the committee were?

Dr. BALLOU. I have not said we worked 5 years? Dr. Charters said that.

Mr. JOHNSON. How long have you been working on it?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know how long we have been working on it.

Mr. JOHNSON. You do not know the names of but two people, and one of them had to be suggested to you that are members of this committee and who have been working on this proposition.

Dr. BALLOU. With 2,900 teachers in the public schools and a large number of committees working on all of these different problems, especially when that committee has not been active for the last several years, it seems to me I could not be expected to remember the names of the persons who served on that committee.

Mr. JOHNSON. I know, but you were very much interested in this?

Dr. BALLOU. I was very much interested.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yet, you cannot name but two people who worked on that committee, and one of them was suggested to you by the chairman.

Dr. BALLOU. No; I cannot name the members of that committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, can you tell us how, where, and in what manner the teaching corps of this city was working, during the 5-year period before October 1934 upon what is now known as the Copeland or character-education experiment?

Mr. BALLOU. I will later furnish a list of the members of that committee for the record at this point.

DR. STEPHEN DUGGAN LETS CAT OUT OF BAG

In his signed letter, published in the Washington Herald on March 6, 1935, Dr. Stephen Duggan said:

In the fall of 1933 I was invited by the Soviet Government to go to Moscow to advise with it. . . . The Soviet was especially anxious to organize a summer school at the Moscow University. . . . Before leaving for Russia I invited a number of distinguished educators to form an advisory council. Everyone invited accepted the invitation. . . . Each professor thought it necessary to give the background of the Soviet philosophy of political and social organization. . . . As there were 13 courses, the students naturally grew tired of the repetition. . . . This fall conferred with representatives of Soviet. I suggested that one fundamental course in the principles of the collective society should be given.

The Washington Herald, February 23, 1935, under headline: "2,000 Educators Get Pamphlets Boosting Moscow College", said:

Communist agents of the Soviet Government of Russia are at work in the lobby of the Mayflower Hotel, spreading subtle propa-

ganda among the more than 2,000 American school teachers attending the convention of the American Progressive Education Association. "Study in the Soviet Union" is on a large poster. Large stacks of pamphlets and other propaganda are distributed daily to the teachers.

The Russian agency is making a drive to enroll large numbers of American school teachers in the summer session of the Moscow University.

Prominent among the names of American educators who are aiding the Moscow University is that of Dr. W. W. Charters, character education consultant for the District public-school system.

In this same paper, Dean Gildersleeve, of Barnard College, from Atlantic City, said:

Bolshevism and communism should not be served to children, nor is it good brain food for freshman and sophomore college courses.

The Washington Herald, February 20, 1935, said:

Dr. Charters is paid \$50 a day for coming to the District 2 days each month to advise teachers on development of the character education program.

Dr. Ballou said he had no idea Dr. Charters had any affiliation with Moscow University when he was appointed here.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr. Ballou admitted in our hearings, that during the 5 years from January 1929 to December 1933, the Commission on the Social Studies was at work, he being secretary for such commission, that Dr. Charles A. Beard printed a book called "A Charter for the Social Sciences", and that Dr. George S. Counts printed a book called "The Social Foundations of Education", but Dr. Ballou claimed that none of the other members of said commission were responsible in any way for said two books, and that only Dr. Counts and Dr. Beard were responsible for same. Both of these books are communistic, and I will show that they were products of Dr. Ballou's said commission, although drafted by said Dr. Beard and Dr. Counts. Dr. Ballou contended that there was but one book gotten up by the Commission on the Social Studies, and that was at the end of its 5 years work, and was called "Conclusions and Recommendations", and he admitted that when it came time for the members to sign it, he would not sign because it was too communistic.

#### "A CHARTER FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES"

While it was drafted by Charles A. Beard, it states that it is "Part I, of the report of the commission on the social studies", and it embraces among the names of the members of the Commission on Direction: Frank W. Ballou, Charles A. Beard, George S. Counts, Carleton J. H. Hayes, and Charles E. Merriam. It states that Harold O. Rugg served on a subcommittee with Beard, Counts, and Merriam to consider objectives, stating:

This committee worked at its task over a period of nearly 2 years. It met with the commission (Dr. Ballou, secretary) at Briarcliff and at Asheville, and held two separate meetings at Chicago and at New York. It met once with the committee on tests (Dr. Ballou, chairman) at New York. Each of the members had an opportunity to present his views of the problem in writing as well as orally. Finally, the committee instructed Mr. Beard to draft a report embodying its collective views. This report was submitted for the consideration of the commission at Briarcliff, October 15, 1930. Every member of the commission was called upon to comment upon the report and did so. The discussion continued for 2 days, and the committee was instructed to prepare a revised statement. This was done, and the revised statement was presented to the commission at Washington, May 7, 1931. Again each member of the commission was called upon for comment. At the conclusion of the discussion a motion to approve the report was made and carried unanimously. Every member of the committee and practically every member of the commission contributed to its composition. Those who followed the discussions closely would have little difficulty in identifying the individual contributions. To Mr. Beard was given the task of gathering from the accumulated mass of written and oral material all the essential contributions and weaving them together into a coherent whole.

#### HOW CAN DR. BALLOU DENY HIS RESPONSIBILITY?

In the face of the above recitations in A Charter for the Social Sciences, how can Dr. Ballou deny his responsibility? When Dr. Ballou was a member of said commission, and was its secretary during the entire 5 years of its work, and he was the chairman of its committee on tests—see page 160, conclusions—serving thereon with Ben D. Wood, a professor of Columbia University, who he thereafter employed to help Dr. W. W. Charters and Dr. Charles R. Mann conduct his



so-called character education experiment in the Washington schools, and when on page 161, conclusions, it is shown that Dr. Ballou was a member of the "committee on the teacher", his chairman being Dr. Bagley, of the Teachers College, Columbia University, how can he deny his responsibility when on page xi of the preface, A Charter for the Social Sciences, Mr. A. C. Krey, chairman of the commission, states emphatically that it was approved by the unanimous vote of the members of said commission, at Washington, D. C., May 7, 1931?

DR. BALLOU'S TESTIMONY, PAGE 558, HEARINGS

Mr. BLANTON. Are you familiar with the further statement in your Professor Jones' said bulletin, Purposeful Teachings, page 2, lines 14-17:

"Charles A. Beard, who drafted A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools, report of the commission on the social studies of the American Historical Association, gives therein a scholarly presentation of general objectives?"

Dr. BALLOU. I would say he gives a scholarly presentation on the philosophy of history.

Mr. BLANTON. Are you aware, Dr. Ballou, of the further fact that, in still another bulletin, Teacher Training in Service, issued by the head of the department of history, Washington high schools, and prepared by your Professor Jones, the teachers have been told, near the bottom of page 2 of said bulletin, that every teacher's professional library should include said A Charter for the Social Studies in the Schools, by Beard?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know that to be true, but I accept it as a statement of fact.

Mr. BLANTON. Are you acquainted, Dr. Ballou, with the following sentence, appearing on page 45 of said book, A Charter for the Social Sciences, written by Beard?

"In some communities supposed to be enlightened, teachers are forbidden to discuss Russia without denouncing her form of government and system of economy."

Dr. BALLOU. Who makes that statement?

Mr. BLANTON. Dr. Beard.

Dr. BALLOU. I am not surprised that he makes it.

Mr. BLANTON. You do recognize that?

Dr. BALLOU. I say I am not surprised he would make it.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you agree with that, Doctor?

Dr. BALLOU. I think there are places where they would deny instruction or forbid the giving of instruction about Russia.

Mr. BLANTON. You haven't any doubt or question, have you, Doctor, that the sentence referred to suggests to teachers that in all really enlightened communities it is proper to discuss Russia in the public schools without denouncing Russia's form of government and system of economy?

Dr. BALLOU. That is the conclusion one might draw from that statement.

Mr. BLANTON. Is that your own opinion?

Dr. BALLOU. No, no, sir; I did not make that statement.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not your opinion?

Dr. BALLOU. No; it is not my opinion; it is not my statement, and I do not accept the statement.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you agree with Dr. Beard on that?

Dr. BALLOU. I would not use the language which he uses there at all.

Mr. BLANTON. You would not use the word "enlightened"?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir; I think that is misleading.

Mr. BLANTON. Then you disagree with Dr. Beard on that?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir; I do, and I disagree with Mr. Beard on a great many things.

Mr. BLANTON. You refused to sign that report, didn't you, Doctor?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir; I refused to sign that report. Moreover, let me add that as to these individual volumes to which you are referring now as having been published by the commission, the commission assumed no collective responsibility for them. They assumed no responsibility for anything except the final volume of conclusions. One of Beard's volumes, and he wrote two of them, the commission did refer to a subcommittee, and it was published with the stamp of composite approval of the commission, but the individual volumes in that series are the product of responsible individuals, for which volumes the commission itself did not assume any responsibility.

DR. BALLOU CONTRADICTED BY HIS OWN CHAIRMAN

In the preface to this part I, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, drafted by Charles A. Beard, on page v, Mr. A. C. Krey, chairman of Dr. Ballou's said commission, says:

This charter of the social sciences, like many another document, is itself the product of history and of the social forces that shaped the thinking of the individuals who sign it.

Who were the individuals who signed it? Their names are found at the end of the book, on page 118 of A Charter for the Social Sciences, and there you will find Dr. Frank W. Ballou's name, along with Chairman Krey, Charles A. Beard, George S. Counts, and the balance of them. Let me quote further from the hearings:

Mr. BLANTON. Now I will refer you to this book, A Charter for the Social Sciences, by Charles A. Beard, and I would like to read a few references from it, because this is one of the books that have been in the libraries of the Washington schools. I read from page 15:

"Again, a book in political science emphasizes one or another aspect of human development and forward tendencies well under way; for example, Rousseau's Social Contract, the handbook of the French Revolution, or Marx's Das Kapital, the bible of socialism."

I read from page 44:

"In some communities, supposed to be enlightened, teachers are forbidden to discuss Russia without denouncing her form of government and system of economy."

The converse of that is that if the communities were actually and really enlightened, they would allow teachers to do that; is not that so?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir; that is the converse.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not agree with that at all?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir. You see, that is in the university field, and I have no knowledge about the control of teaching in universities.

Mr. BLANTON. Dr. Beard doesn't want teachers to denounce Russia's form of government. I read from page 49, more from Dr. Beard:

"By rapidly multiplying ties of trade, capital investment, and intercourse, the United States is being woven ever more closely into a world fabric, drawn into a network of international arrangements."

I now read from page 65:

"In spite of our free schools and extraordinary educational advances, authoritative opinion holds that education depends too largely on family tradition and circumstance. To prepare the ground for a more even adjustment of the balance is one of the objectives in the teaching of social science."

I read again from the same page:

"There is no reason why society should tax itself to provide educational facilities for those whose chief concern is the exploitation of the public to personal advantage."

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, are you acquainted with the following statements appearing on pages 98 and 99 of said book, A Charter for the Social Sciences, by Dr. Beard? [reading]:

"Yet, speaking summarily, we may say that the primary information which social science must supply through the schools to individuals is information concerning the conditioning elements, realities, forces, and ideas of the modern world in which life must be lived. Any representation of them is bound to be partial and out of perspective, such is the frailty of the human mind, but it must be attempted in textbooks, supplementary works, maps, motion pictures, and every possible apparatus for conveying information vividly and realistically to the immature mind."

Do you agree with that statement as proper pedagogy?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not agree with most of Dr. Beard's philosophy about the writing of history that is contained in that volume.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you agree with him when he says it is "bound to be partial and out of perspective"?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not agree with that.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not agree with that?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir.

DR. BALLOU ADMITS THAT BEARD AND COUNTS ARE "RADICALS"

After serving with them for 5 years on a commission, he being its secretary, Dr. Frank W. Ballou says that both Dr. Charles A. Beard and Dr. George S. Counts are "radicals", and they are the ones whom Dr. Ballou says wrote "Conclusions and Recommendations", which was the main product of the 5 years' work of his Commission on the Social Studies:

Mr. DITTER. You understand what I mean by the term "radical"?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. Interpreting my use of the term, would you say, sir, that there were any in this group who would fall into that category, such as I have described by the term "radical"?

Dr. BALLOU. I am clearly of the opinion that the discussion shows that is so.

Mr. DITTER. Would you care to give us your opinion as to where one Charles A. Beard would fall in such a classification?

Dr. BALLOU. I think he is an extreme left-end man.

Mr. DITTER. By left-end man, do you mean by that "radical"?

Dr. BALLOU. A liberal or radical.

Mr. DITTER. Very liberal or radical?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. DITTER. Would you say that George S. Counts would fall in that same category?

Dr. BALLOU. I think he stands very close to Mr. Beard.

Mr. DITTER. The fact of the matter is, Doctor, that you have definitely indicated in these hearings that in the final analysis the acceptance or the rejection of any textbook is a matter that rests in your hands?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. And that the Board of Education has followed in all instances your recommendation for the purchase of textbooks?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes; that is agreed.

Mr. DITTER. Then, passing on that responsibility, any funds that are used for the purchase of textbooks are funds that are used as a result of either your suggestion to your Board of Education or your justification before this committee?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes.



Mr. DITTER. And if this committee directs your attention to its objection to textbooks you in turn would assume personal responsibility for the use of any public money for that purpose if you failed to follow the suggestions of this committee?

Dr. BALLOU. Oh, yes.

Mr. DITTER. That is true, isn't it, Doctor?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir; but may I add this statement to that—that if the wishes of this committee are made known to me in connection with this appropriation bill which we are considering now I shall comply with them.

Mr. DITTER. My impression is, just as a passing interjection, that this committee will likely make known its opinion with respect to certain textbooks and certain magazines in the schools.

Now, Doctor, I was interested in your observation about the matter of textbook selection. In the final analysis, you are the one who either approves or disapproves of any textbook; isn't that true?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. As superintendent of schools the work of the high-school principal or of a textbook committee is only a recommendation as to textbooks?

Dr. BALLOU. That is right, sir.

Mr. DITTER. In the discharge of your duty to the District you may either accept that recommendation or refuse to accept it?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. DITTER. And if you found as a result of endorsement and recommendation that any textbooks had been selected in times past to which criticism had been directed, it would be within your province to remove from your textbook committee any of the teachers who had heretofore made recommendations of undesirable textbooks?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes; it would be.

Mr. DITTER. That would be true, Doctor?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. The matter of the selection of this textbook committee is a matter that falls within your province entirely. It is not a matter of existing law, rule, or regulation?

Dr. BALLOU. Not at all.

Mr. DITTER. It is part of your administrative scheme for the schools of the District. Isn't that true?

Dr. BALLOU. That is right.

#### DR. BALLOU'S APPROVED COMMUNISTIC BOOK "MADE IN RUSSIA"

I challenge any patriotic Congressman or any patriotic parent in Washington to give me any semblance of an excuse why Dr. Ballou and his Board of Education have prescribed communistic propaganda like the book *Made in Russia* for the boys and girls of Washington to read. There is but one reason why. To indoctrinate them! This book does not depict true conditions in Russia. It deliberately misrepresents conditions. It falsely pictures everything as beautiful and enticing, when in fact they are ugly and repulsive. For illustration, I quote a few passages from *Made in Russia*:

The younger generation, Russian boys and girls born in the 15 years since the revolution, are eager to ring in the new Russia.

A land covering one-sixth of all the earth, the richest nation in the world in natural wealth, with gold, oil, platinum, coal, and iron beneath its soil in infinite plenty—this is the Russian land.

Russia added to the things she copied something new, something original, something Russian: the factories, the dams, the dynamos, and the machines are owned.

Whatever profits the American factory may earn belong to the owner; the workers receive only their wages. In Russia the government owns all the factories, and the government gets all the profits. The workers feel that they are the owners of the factory. Russia declares that every source of wealth and profit belongs to the state.

Lenin believed that only by a revolution could the old problem be solved, borrowing ideas from Karl Marx, and insisted that only by revolution, in which the lower classes would rise and kill any who opposed them, could the change be made, and took the name "Communists." Lenin came into power in November 1917, and abolished private property. Wealthy men were forced to flee, while all they owned was taken from them.

The Soviet Government tries to raise the standard of all the people together and believes that the factory working classes in all other countries of the world should likewise, by revolution and bloodshed, abolish private property and unite in one world-wide Soviet Union.

Today it is the children of Russia who are the leaders. Life in Russia today somewhat resembles life as it was lived on the frontier of America 60 years ago.

In America you look forward, perhaps, to growing up to live as your parents live. In Russia the boys and girls look forward to a life totally different from that of their parents, without the poverty and the ignorance.

Communists know that eventually the older people will die off, and the Soviet has won the support of the new Russians. Even with the smallest children the government begins its work. They take pride in their factories. Crowds with bands and banners turn out to welcome the first trainload of coal or to greet a new locomotive.

These boys and girls of new Russia are taught differently from you in America. They are taught that our whole system of private property, of individual wealth, is wrong. They are taught that all nations will abolish private property some day. These new

Russians will some day control their nation. Many are the things made in Russia. Nothing in all Russian history is more important than these new Russians "made" today in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

About the only true statement depicted in the book is the following:

The government fought and still fights religion. It teaches that religion is ignorance. There can be no Sunday school or religious instruction for children. Visits to sacred shrines, which once every good Russian was supposed to make, are now forbidden by law. Thus the revolution upset the entire church system.

#### HAS 35 COPIES OF "MADE IN RUSSIA" IN LIBRARIES

Librarian Bowerman, answering my questions, writes:

I find that we have 35 copies of White's *Made in Russia*, mostly in children's rooms, but including one in adult division of our central library and one branch.

Re your letter to librarian of our southeastern branch, the reply to your inquiry is required to go through my office. I am, therefore, inclosing a memorandum prepared by Miss Osborne.

Inasmuch as the southeastern branch copy of *Boy and Girl Tramps of America*, which had been sent to the bindery, had not yet been rebound, it is being forwarded herewith.

The book by Minehan, *Boy and Girl Tramps of America*, had been used so much its cover had about been worn off, and when Judge Sullivan asked for it at southeastern, Miss Osborn told him it was in the bindery to have new covers put on it. I also inquired whether since we began our investigation in January any instructions had been issued about this book and learned that the librarian had taken action about its use by children. From Miss Osborne's replies to my questions I quote:

The information given by Judge Sullivan is entirely correct. The book *Boy and Girl Tramps of America*, by Minehan, is still in the bindery, but as we find that it has not yet been taken apart, we have asked the bindery to send it to you.

It is a fact that adult cards are issued to pupils, commencing with the tenth grade.

We were advised by the librarian over the telephone to take this book in question off of the open shelves and to put it in a restricted collection. This was in February 1936.

We have *Made in Russia*, and it is being sent to you.

MINEHAN BOOK IS VILE, INDECENT, VULGAR, PROFANE, BLASPHEMOUS, AND DEGRADING

Just why the libraries accessible to Washington school children were filled with such a vile book was beyond the comprehension of our committee. We showed it to 50 of the leading men in Congress. Without hesitation, they all pronounced it degrading and terrible, and wholly unfit for school children, and we made Dr. Ballou admit that it (especially pp. 39 and 154) is too indecent to be read by men. I will later show how the communistic magazine *Scholastic*, which Dr. Ballou and his Board of Education, despite numerous complaints and the demand of our subcommittee, have refused to take out of the 175 Washington schools, deliberately quoted from this infamous book and advertised it to school children, which made them read it until the covers of one copy were worn off. Remember what Judge Sullivan said: "It is a part of the plan of Communists to break down morals and destroy sex morality." Communists could not have chosen a better book for such purpose. I quote from page 742 of our hearings:

Mr. BLANTON. Here is a book, *European Civilization and Politics Since 1815*, by Erik Achorn.

Since this so-called red rider that I understand you condemn was passed, and since the question was raised here about teachers not teaching communism in the schools forced this order from Dr. Frank W. Ballou, superintendent of schools, Franklin Administration Building, Thirteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C., dated December 18, 1935:

ORDER DISCONTINUING USE OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION AND POLITICS  
"To the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

"LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It has come to my attention through Mr. George J. Jones, head of the department of history, that he and President Higbie, of the Wilson Teachers College, as well as Dr. Carr, professor of the social studies, are of the opinion that Achorn's *European Civilization and Politics* may be construed as too favorable toward communism.

"On the basis of that information I have this day directed that the use of this book be discontinued in the two teachers' colleges."

THE TRUE FACTS ABOUT RUSSIA, WHICH WASHINGTON CHILDREN ARE NOT TAUGHT

Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling is one of our experts on Russia, communism, and radicals in the United States. In her book



The Red Network, copyrighted in 1934, with four editions printed since then, she describes Russia as she found it. She says:

Communism has made over for universal poverty. Unceasingly great train loads of those resisting "collectivization" travel the rails to Siberia, we counting recently in 4 weeks' time 17 trainloads, some 40 cars long, of such people. Men, women, and children peered out through bars enroute to hard labor, prison camps, or death in Siberia, now populated as never before with exiled peasants who have spoken bitterly about or resisted the giving up of their pigs, cows, or little homes or nearly all of their grain, or have offended by upholding religion, and consequently are being punished.

In Moscow I saw near hotels, during late night and early morning hours, the "wild" or deserted children sleeping in doorways. They are produced by conditions of low living and fostered by communistic government destruction of faith in God, religion, and morality. Lenin's wife said, "We have 7,000,000 deserted children officially registered and 80,000 in asylums."

Couples may simply live together or register quickly as married or divorced by payment of a ruble. They can hardly support the children of several successive unions.

A hospital we visited bragged of 40 abortions performed that morning and a movie showed pictorially to a mixed audience the old and new abortion methods and the benefits of the latter. As the Fish report shows: "The most terrible kinds of vice are encouraged among the young school children in order to break down their family influence."

My friends, Mr. and Mrs. George Cretors, tell of the openly free sex relations between the 700 children between the ages of 11 and 17 in a children's institution, and of indecent practices taught in the school by a Soviet official from Moscow. All the churches have been converted into antireligious museums. Beautiful St. Isaac's Cathedral in Leningrad is now used as an atheist theater as part of the new 5-year plan to close all houses of worship and to eradicate even the thought of God from the minds of the people by a militant anti-God campaign.

In one store buzzing flies fought over three cheese, priced at \$4.55, and \$6 per pound. Three fish displayed were priced at \$3.75 per pound, and a thin, fly-specked box of candy was priced at \$5. small individual pieces priced at 20 cents each. There was no meat or ice (in August) in the store. Everything is strictly rationed. Soap was \$1.30 a bar and limited to two bars a month. Black bread, dried herring, and cucumbers seemed to be the actual purchases of the average buyer. Milk is sold at a special store and only to those with certificates.

I saw no one working on buildings. I saw scaffoldings, but was told that nobody had worked on them for 3 years.

Two of the three busses we rode in broke down. The streets and roads were very much torn up and rutted, and cars were trembling and unsure. On one trip a wheel came off and the axle broke on another. I was told there were over 70 Rolls-Royces then in use in Moscow as the private cars of Soviet officials. The poor bundle-laden proletarian walks or hangs out of an overcrowded street car. Dinginess, bad smells, and a sense of fear pervaded everything.

The last manager of the Grand Hotel in Moscow with his wife and children had been awakened at 3 o'clock in the morning by the secret police and had not been heard of since. Letters are opened and glued together before delivered. All dispatches by foreign newspaper correspondents are censored before entering or leaving Russia. Our ship was not allowed to use its radio while within Russian waters.

Russians pay out about 30 percent of their earnings in taxes, such as the privilege of reading newspapers, etc. All workers must occasionally "voluntarily" give their whole month's wages to the Government as a loan. Russians are forbidden to possess foreign money. Guards, barbed wire, spies, and heavy penalties inflicted on relatives left behind deter Russians from leaving Russia.

In our Moscow hotel were bed bugs and listless waiters. The hotel elevator ran once in a while when not out of order. The dingy-windowed empty stores which line the streets gave a dismal appearance. The outcast peddlers were ragged and wretched looking.

While I was in Moscow, factory workers who had long protested bad working conditions decided to strike. At once soldiers and machine guns surrounded the factory. The workers were given 15 minutes to decide whether to work or be blown to bits. They worked.

When over 1,000 Communists rioted in front of the Chicago school board's offices, they bore a placard: "We want Soviet conditions here." Some misguided Americans, openly or covertly, are echoing this sentiment. The universities seem to have joined the gutter Communists in "going red." No free-born American can conceive of the Soviet despotic regulation of the smallest personal matters of conduct and conversation, nor understand the haunting fear of the terrorist secret police.

#### WANT TRUE FACTS ABOUT RUSSIA TAUGHT

Every true American wants the real facts about Russia taught. But they do not want untrue pictures and misrepresentations. It is the Communists who do not want the true facts about Russia taught in the schools. They want perverted misrepresentations.

#### "THE SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION"

Although prepared by Dr. George S. Counts, in the preface Chairman Krey says that it is a part of the report of the American Historical Association "Commission on the Social Studies"; that "its plan was submitted to the executive committee of the commission (Dr. Ballou its secretary) for criticisms and suggestions"; that "it was then approved by the commission; and that "the commission has profited greatly by Dr. Counts' knowledge."

On page 9 Dr. Counts acknowledges help from four professors of Columbia University in writing, and said: "I am greatly indebted to Dr. Charles A. Beard, who helped me plan the book." He said he was indebted also to Covici, Friede, Inc., for use of its book by Polakov. As a heading on its flyleaf is: "Investigation of the Social Studies in the Schools", and upon the next page is:

Commission on direction: Frank W. Ballou, superintendent of schools, Washington, D. C.; Charles A. Beard, formerly professor, Columbia University; George S. Counts, professor, Teachers College, Columbia University—

And the names of the other members of the commission.

#### WHAT DR. BALLOU'S PROFESSOR JONES SAYS ABOUT IT

Prof. George J. Jones, head of the department of social studies, under Dr. Ballou in the Washington schools, with Prof. Paul E. Lutz—another of Dr. Ballou's professors—were mentioned on page 154 of Conclusions and Recommendations as having rendered valuable services to the commission during the 5 years Dr. Ballou served as its secretary. While Prof. George J. Jones was testifying at our hearings I quoted from the said George S. Counts' The Social Foundations of Education the following:

"The Federal Constitution, with its system of checks and balances, represents a deep distrust of popular rule.

"Democracy provides the dominant spiritual note in the development of the Nation and may be expected to guide both statesmen and educators in the definition of the goals of their practical endeavors. That it is not to be identified with any special set of institutions—economic, political, or social—is one of its merits.

"The application of the democratic ideal to the trend toward an integrated society calls for a threefold course of action. The disassociation of democracy from its historical connections with the individualistic economy of the past; the free and voluntary acceptance of the interdependent economy out of knowledge and understanding; and the organization and administration of the economic mechanism in the interests of the masses of the people."

Now I quote from page 555:

"The present volume, as well as the other reports of the commission, assumes from first to last that the public school may be expected to make a genuine and positive contribution to the solution of the numerous social problems confronting the American people."

Mr. JONES. Of course, with that I must absolutely disagree.

Mr. BLANTON. You disagree with that?

Mr. JONES. Oh, absolutely. That is not our function.

"WITH THAT" DR. BALLOU'S PROFESSOR JONES "MUST ABSOLUTELY DISAGREE"

Remember that this book, The Social Foundation of Education, with which Professor Jones said he "must absolutely disagree" was a part of the 5 years' work of, and was approved by the commission, for which Dr. Ballou served 5 years as secretary, Dr. Ballou's name being on its front page as one of its sponsors. I quote further:

Mr. BLANTON. You are also aware, are you not, that this selfsame George S. Counts has written and published another book entitled "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?", in which he makes plain that his use of the term "democracy" is contrary to everything American, his assertions being:

"That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction."

That is from page 28.

Mr. JONES. I am absolutely opposed to that.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not agree with George Counts?

Mr. JONES. Absolutely, no.

Mr. BLANTON. Still quoting:

"The conscious and deliberate achievement of democracy under novel circumstances is the task of our generation.

"Democracy of course should not be identified with political forms and functions—with the Federal Constitution, the popular election of officials, or the practice of universal suffrage."

Do you agree with that?

Mr. JONES. I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. Continuing quoting:

"Finally be prepared as a last resort, in either the defense or the realization of this purpose, to follow the method of revolution."

That is from pages 41 and 42.



Mr. JONES. That is terrible.  
 Mr. BLANTON. You don't admit that as a school teacher?  
 Mr. JONES. Admit it? I would not use the word "admit."  
 Mr. JOHNSON. What word would you use?  
 Mr. BLANTON. You would say it was damnable, would you not?  
 Mr. JONES. Absolutely.

DR. BALLOU'S PROFESSOR JONES SAYS "TERRIBLE" AND "DAMNABLE"

When Professor Jones denounces Dr. Count's book as "terrible" and as "damnable", he is talking about a collaborator of Dr. Ballou, with whom Dr. Ballou worked 5 years to bring about "a new philosophy of education", and it is, and it is Dr. Ballou's head of social studies who is doing the denouncing. I quote further:

Mr. BLANTON. You know, do you not, that this self-same George S. Counts, who thus boldly advocates "the method of revolution" to establish a new pretense of democracy without "popular election of officials" or "the practice of universal suffrage" is not only one of the authors of the report of the commission on the social studies, used to instruct Washington public-school teachers as to "methods", but he is also the editor of a magazine called The Social Frontier, and upon the executive board of another magazine called The Social Studies, both of which magazines have been in use in the public schools of this District for a number of years. That is so, is it not?

Mr. JONES. I believe that they are purchased for library use.

Mr. BLANTON. They are purchased by Dr. Ballou, using the money that we gave him and they are now in our school libraries, are they not?

Mr. JONES. I think so.

Mr. BLANTON. You know, do you not, Prof. Harold Rugg, of Teachers' College, Columbia University, who is social studies editor of Scholastic, a national high school weekly magazine, and who served on the special advisory committee on objectives of the Commission on the Social Studies?

You know him, do you not?

Mr. JONES. I know who he is. I do not know him personally.

Mr. BLANTON. Your attention is invited to page 4 of the Washington Public School Document No. 2, 1933, to which I referred a moment ago, and which you have there, relating to course of study in history and other social sciences, and listing, under approved periodicals, the magazine, Scholastic, by Harold Rugg.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Please state how long this magazine, Scholastic, has been in use in the Washington high schools for any purpose, whether as a library or study magazine, or both, and for what subjects as a study magazine, if so used.

Mr. JONES. It has been used for some years.

Mr. BLANTON. It is purchased by him and is in the school libraries, is it not?

Mr. JONES. I think it is purchased by the students for classrooms' use, in English classes.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, they would not do that unless they were told to do it, would they?

Mr. JONES. They would not use it unless it is officially listed.

Mr. BLANTON. Your attention is invited to the following editorial on page 1 of said magazine, Scholastic, issue of December 9, 1933.

Mr. JONES. I have read many copies of Scholastic.

Mr. BLANTON. Then you would probably recognize this:

"Scholastic does not and will not attempt to indoctrinate its readers with specific, unalterable beliefs. Nevertheless, its editors have certain considered convictions as to society which they have no apologies for presenting to students as powerfully as they can."

Mr. BLANTON. Do you agree with it?

Mr. JONES. I absolutely do not.

Mr. BLANTON. Their duty is to teach children how to think and not what to think, is that right?

Mr. JONES. From what you told me, or from what you read there, their policy is to indoctrinate.

Mr. BLANTON. That is exactly what this means, does it not?

Mr. JONES. That is indoctrination.

Mr. BLANTON. Why, surely. In other words, he starts out by trying to get away from indoctrination and then espouses it, does he not?

Mr. JONES. He does.

Mr. BLANTON. Whenever a teacher attempts to tell his students as powerfully as he can, something, he means to indoctrinate them.

Mr. JONES. He is indoctrinating.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does Dr. Ballou and this other person share in that belief?

Mr. BLANTON. Scholastic has been put in the libraries of the Washington schools, has it not?

Mr. JONES. It is purchased by students.

Mr. BLANTON. If it teaches indoctrination, it is not wholesome, is it?

Mr. JONES. No, sir; it is not.

Mr. BLANTON. And that expression of "presenting to students as powerfully as they can" what they believe, that is indoctrination.

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Are you acquainted with editorial on page 1 of Scholastic magazine, issue of December 17, 1932, stating:

"The national flower, says one headline writer, has become the 'razzberry.'"

"The mood of disillusionment has indeed settled over the present generation."

"A journalist who traveled the country over and talked with hundreds of ordinary, obscure men and women in all walks of life came back with a profound impression that the American people have no national faith."

Do you agree with that editorial?

Mr. JONES. I absolutely disagree.

Mr. BLANTON. It is your belief that the American people as a whole do have a national faith?

Mr. JONES. It is.

Mr. BLANTON. Are you acquainted with editorial note on page 7 of Scholastic Magazine, issue of November 10, 1934, using the following language commendatory of the author of a recent book featured in such issue:

"Here, in rigid logic, he examines such popular beliefs as 'national honor', 'patriotism', 'security',—and exposes their childishness and hypocrisy."

Mr. JONES. I am not acquainted with it.

Mr. BLANTON. But you do not agree with that?

Mr. JONES. I do not agree with it.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not agree with it?

Mr. JONES. No; it is terrible.

Mr. BLANTON. There is such a thing as national honor that is not childishness and hypocrisy?

Mr. JONES. Absolutely.

Mr. BLANTON. There is such a thing as patriotism that is not childishness and hypocrisy, is there not?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. There is such a thing as national security that is not childishness and hypocrisy?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Are you acquainted with special article in Scholastic Magazine, issue of November 9, 1935, in which, on page 12, it is pointedly suggested that "the romantic appeal" is "a tricky lie", and that "a dirty trick is being played" upon those who respond to "some patriotic slogan"?

Mr. JONES. I am not acquainted with it.

Mr. BLANTON. You believe in people responding to patriotic slogans, do you not?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not believe that "the romantic appeal" is "a tricky lie", do you?

Mr. JONES. I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you claim any possible justification or excuse for such plain, unpatriotic propaganda entering the public schools of Washington?

Mr. JONES. Such articles as that, such ideas as that, should not be carried to either teachers or pupils.

Mr. BLANTON. It should not be inculcated either to teachers or children?

Mr. JONES. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Are you acquainted with the succession of articles in Scholastic, featuring Russian communism as elevating; for instance, in the issue of December 16, 1933, page 16:

"Today 6,000,000 young Russians in the Communist Youth Association are helping to build a new social world."

Do you agree with the idea of fostering such ideas as that in our children?

Mr. JONES. I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. I am giving you direct quotations. You will find each one of these on the pages indicated. Now, I quote from January 20, 1934, page 21:

"But the Russian planners do not stop short with material things. They promise to increase the number of students in their country about 50 percent and reduce illiteracy by requiring every child to attend school at least 7 years."

From what you have heard of Russia, and the way they are treating the ordinary poor person there, do you believe that that is true?

Mr. JONES. I do not. I read Asia for the first time about a month ago, and I immediately recommended that the magazine be taken out.

Mr. BLANTON. Out of the schools?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That was a month ago?

Mr. JONES. Something like that.

Mr. BLANTON. And they took it out?

Mr. JONES. Well, if they did not, it is on its way out.

Mr. BLANTON. But you do not know that it has been taken out yet?

Mr. JONES. I do not know.

Mr. BLANTON. But you did recommend that it be taken out of the schools?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And it has been in the schools until a month ago, has it not?

Mr. JONES. I think so.

Mr. BLANTON. But if we had not stopped communism in the schools, you possibly would not have read it, is not that so?

Mr. JONES. Possibly.

Mr. BLANTON. That brought the issue before you, did it not?

Mr. JONES. Possibly.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me quote a little further. From the issue of October 6, 1934, page 12, they say:



"The older transients, it is true, resist communism. They have a mental hold-over of war psychology, the antired drives of Palmer, and a belief in the American success story. For boys and girls, communism offers school, hope, and adventure."

Did you know that that was in a magazine that was being used by pupils in the schools here, and prescribed in their courses, and kept in the school libraries?

Mr. JONES. I did not.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not agree with that doctrine, do you?

Mr. JONES. I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. Now I quote from the issue of January 4, 1936, page 23. This is from Scholastic, where they expressly commend the procommunist book, I Write as I Please, by Walter Duranty, as "dynamic, objective, and reliable about the Soviet experiment."

Are you acquainted with that book? The title is "I Write as I Please", by Walter Duranty.

Mr. JONES. No; I am not.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that Scholastic, in this issue, expressly commends this procommunist book?

Mr. JONES. No; I did not know that.

Mr. BLANTON. And says that it is dynamic, objective, and reliable?

You know, do you not, Professor Jones, that this Harold Rugg, whom I mentioned a little while ago, who is social studies editor of Scholastic, has written and published a book called The Great Technology?

Mr. JONES. I have heard of it.

Mr. BLANTON. In which he stated:

"Nothing about this story of degradation is clearer than that in any of those decades a fairly decent standard of living could have been had by the peoples of the expanding West. That it was not and is not today can be traced primarily to the theory and practice of government set up by our fathers."

That is from page 95.

Did you know that he had given vent to that kind of expression?

Mr. JONES. I did not.

Mr. BLANTON. Also from page 234 [reading]:

"School administrators and teachers should lead actively in the formation of public opinion."

Mr. JONES. Of course, I disagree with that.

Mr. BLANTON. You disagree with that?

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. You disagree with a lot that has gone on in the schools here. Let me quote further from pages 259 and 260 of this Harold Rugg's Great Technology:

"It is this which compels the formal, unthinking salute to the flag, and the mumbling of an oath of allegiance which means absolutely nothing to the young people making it. It is this which, in hundreds of communities compels teachers to sign oaths of allegiance, and swear that they will protect the written Constitution of the United States."

Mr. BLANTON. Your attention is called to your Washington Public Schools Document No. 2 of 1933, listing Changing Civilizations in the Modern World by Harold Rugg as a textbook for slow-going pupils, in the junior and senior high schools. During what period of time has this textbook been so used?

Mr. JONES. Oh, roughly, well, let's see, well, 1932, or 1933, up until last June, when the course in which it was used, was dropped.

Mr. BLANTON. It is since Dr. Ballou, George Counts, and Dr. W. W. Charters have been engaged in this 5-year program, isn't it?

Mr. JONES. Yes; but Dr. Ballou had but a small part in bringing that book into use.

Mr. BLANTON. But, it was brought into our schools with his approval, and he is superintendent and draws a salary of \$10,000 a year.

Mr. JONES. I had some part in bringing this book into use.

Mr. BLANTON. How many copies of the book were purchased that you know of out of school funds?

Mr. JONES. Well, I have the record about that in my office, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. Quite a number of copies?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir; there were quite a number of copies. It might run to about 500, 600, 700, or 800, something like that.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you consider proper the treatment of Russian communism in said textbook, Changing Civilizations in the Modern World, without any disclosure of its subversive nature and evil consequences, conveying to students the idea that Russian communism has raised the standard of living?

Mr. JONES. I do not. There is a page that appears to favor communism. I recommended in December that the book be taken from the list. The textbook committee had its first meeting of the school year last December.

Mr. BLANTON. That is another one that has been taken from the list, has it?

Mr. JONES. That book would have been taken from the list anyway.

Mr. JOHNSON. Don't you think that questionable page would have been sufficient to have eliminated the whole of it?

Mr. JONES. Yes; I think so now. I did not think so at the time.

Mr. JOHNSON. Don't you think it is just such things that are dangerous, where they go along treating things beautifully and then they slip?

Mr. JONES. I do; yes. There is that danger.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the subversive part of it, isn't it?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; that is what I mean.

Mr. JONES. I fear so. There may be danger, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the insidious part of it, isn't it?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Professor Jones, the ones that you call the slow-going students, whom you had in mind when you put this book in, the slow-thinking people furnish the most fertile field for the indoctrination of communism that you can find anywhere; isn't that so?

Mr. JONES. It is probably true; yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the reason so many Negroes have been communized, isn't it?

Mr. JONES. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. They are taught to believe that they are not treated properly and that they have not a proper chance or opportunity and that they are being imposed upon, and so forth; isn't that the fact?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This book which you have taken out did commend communism, didn't it?

Mr. JONES. There is one page there that was rather bad. It might appear to favor communism. An offsetting statement is lacking.

Mr. JOHNSON. How long were these books in the schools before you ordered them out?

Mr. JONES. Something like 3 years, I should judge.

Mr. BLANTON. It was during this three-cornered, 5-year program we have been talking about.

Your attention is invited, Professor Jones, to a textbook in the high schools of Washington entitled "Modern History", by Carl Becker, approved by the Board of Education on recommendation of Dr. Ballou.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. For use commencing February 1, 1933. You remember that?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. How many copies of this textbook, including both the 1933 and 1935 issues, have been purchased and used in the high schools of Washington?

Mr. JONES. Oh, it would again go into several hundred.

Mr. BLANTON. Several hundred?

Mr. JONES. Six hundred, seven hundred, eight hundred, or nine hundred.

Mr. BLANTON. All of these books that we have mentioned have been approved by Dr. Ballou?

Mr. JONES. Yes; and the Board of Education.

Mr. JOHNSON. They are put on the eligible list and are permissible to the principals if they want them.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. You are aware, are you not, Professor Jones, that this same Prof. Carl Becker has written and published a book called The United States, an Experiment in Democracy; you are acquainted with that book?

Mr. JONES. Yes; I have glanced through it.

Mr. BLANTON. In which he states that immigrants "describe America as they have found it—a country dominated by capitalists, a sordid bourgeois society without ideals, a land of 'dollar-chasers' where wealth controls the Government and exploits the people"—quoting from page 234.

Did you know that he is indoctrinating that kind of ideas?

Mr. JONES. He states that immigrants describe America in that way?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I did not know that he did.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you agree with that?

Mr. JONES. I have never spoken—

Mr. BLANTON. Do you agree with that idea he is trying to put before the people, before these slow-thinking students and slow-going students? There are some slow-thinking teachers, aren't there, as well as students? You have found them, haven't you?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In every class you will find some slow thinkers and slow-going students, won't you?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In other words, he describes America to them; he puts that suggestion to them that it is "a country dominated by capitalists, a sordid bourgeois society without ideals, a land of 'dollar-chasers' where wealth controls the Government and exploits the people."

Mr. JONES. I do not think that Carl Becker would describe Americans in that way.

Mr. BLANTON. He did do it.

Mr. JOHNSON. But, he is using the immigrant, putting in thought what he himself wants to convey to the people.

Mr. BLANTON. He wants to convey that thought to the people, and he does convey it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; he is using the immigrant just as a vehicle to convey the idea.

Mr. JONES. I am not so certain of that.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you agree with that kind of doctrine?

Mr. JOHNSON. From immigrants or anybody else?

Mr. BLANTON. From anybody.

Mr. JONES. I disagree with that doctrine.

Mr. JACOBSEN. I believe I can answer Mr. Becker's statement there perhaps as well as anybody, being an immigrant myself, to show how wrong he is. He himself is an anarchist, and he uses the word "immigrant" as a vehicle to voice his own argument. If he were to ask the average immigrant, he would find the statement is not true.



You know, the immigrant coming to this country appreciates it more than the average boy who is born here or raised here. My boys and my grandsons do not appreciate the liberties of this country like I do. They grow up, and when they are 20 years old they say, "Next year I begin to vote." That is just a matter of fact, and they become citizens, but the man or the boy that comes over from some foreign country who has got to swear allegiance to the flag remembers that forever after. He renounces his own fatherland, his mother country, and he becomes a citizen and the oath of citizenship is forever with him and he appreciates the country perhaps as much, or more so, than a great many boys that are born right here.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad you made that statement.

You are aware, Professor Jones, are you not, that Prof. Carl Becker has printed or published a later book, in 1932, entitled "The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers", lauding Marxist communism as a "new religion", on page 161, respecting which he says: "The duty of common men is to adjust themselves." That is on page 162—and adding the following enthusiastic assertion or declaration:

"And now, in our day, the first act in the social revolution, accompanied and sustained by the Communist faith, has just been staged in Russia."

That is on page 163. Did you know that he had written that book?

Mr. JONES. I have glanced through the book.

Mr. BLANTON. You are, of course, familiar with what is said respecting Marxist communism and Soviet Russia in Carl Becker's textbook Modern History, still in use in the Washington high schools, the laudation of Marxist communism, commencing on page 534, and Soviet Russia being featured, commencing on page 790, as having become "every year more popular", page 799, following a laudation of Lenin as a great leader "in the crusade for human freedom", page 791.

You are also necessarily aware that said textbook makes no disclosure of the subversive nature of the Soviet Government directed against our own Government through the Third Internationale and substitute for an explanation of the enslaving features of Russian communism a misdescription of Russian communism as something elevating and popular.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. BLANTON. Now, let me ask how many members of the Board of Education are here?

Mrs. DOYLE. Three, Mr. Chairman; Mr. Quinn, Dr. Maurer, and myself.

Mr. BLANTON. During the 8 years you have been on the board, has Dr. Ballou, the superintendent of schools, ever recommended the adoption of any textbooks that the board has refused to adopt?

Mrs. DOYLE. I think not.

Mr. BLANTON. During that 8 years has Dr. Ballou ever recommended any collateral reading books for the schools on which you have turned him down?

Mrs. DOYLE. I think not.

Mr. BLANTON. During that 8 years has Dr. Ballou ever made any request for any reading matter for any of the libraries in the schools on which you have turned him down?

Mrs. DOYLE. Not that I recall.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not recall any time when you refused to follow his recommendation?

Mrs. DOYLE. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, in one of those Scholastic magazines—you will find it in the hearings—it eulogizes very highly a book called Boy and Girl Tramps of America, by Thomas Minehan, which today, after his attention was called to it, Dr. Ballou himself characterizes as one of the most vulgar, vile, indecent, and disreputable books that anyone could ever find printed anywhere, and I think Dr. Ballou here will agree with me in that characterization.

Is your Board of Education looking into these complaints?

Mrs. DOYLE. Those that we get, every one of them; yes. We do not get all of these, you know.

Mr. BLANTON. This book, Boy and Girl Tramps of America, quoted from and highly recommended by Scholastic, is too disreputable for any woman to ever look at; but if you would get some member of your family, some man in your family, to get it and read it, he will tell you that it is one of the vilest pieces of literature ever printed, that ought not to be allowed to be sold in the stores.

Mrs. DOYLE. Then I won't inflict that even on the men members of my family.

DR. BALLOU AND BOARD OF EDUCATION LAUGHED AT AND IGNORED ALL COMPLAINTS

Mr. BLANTON. You have approximately how many different schools in Washington under you that belong to the public-school system of the District of Columbia?

Dr. BALLOU. About 175.

Mr. BLANTON. Different ones of our schools scattered all over the District of Columbia?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. You have been superintendent how long, Doctor?

Dr. BALLOU. Since July 1, 1920.

Mr. BLANTON. It appears that within a short time after you became superintendent of schools, you recommended, and the Board of Education approved as a textbook in the public schools, a book entitled, "American History", by David S. Muzzey. Is it still a textbook?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. In the schools?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir; still in use. And I would like to add for the information of the committee that an assault was made on it in this city as was made on it in other cities.

A long hearing was conducted one evening by a committee of the Board of Education that went thoroughly into the merits and demerits of the charges against that book, and presented an extended printed report which was approved by the Board of Education continuing the book in use in the city.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you recall that there was much protest against the further use of said book, American History, by Muzzey, 1920 edition, such protests including the Constitutional Review of July 1922; the Official Bulletin of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution of October 1922 (p. 29); Judge Wallace McCamant, past president general of the Sons of the American Revolution and an ex-justice of the Supreme Court of Oregon; the Piney Branch Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia; and the Brightwood Citizens' Association, also of this District; Judge McCamant declaring that Muzzey "has no abiding conviction in American fundamentals; no enthusiastic veneration for the great men who founded the Republic"; that he (Muzzey) "is a near socialist", "unfair", and "a political partisan", and that his history is "utterly unfit for school use"; and the Official Bulletin of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution declared [reading]:

"When we stop to contemplate the effect of such a book upon the young minds of our country, it makes the blood boil."

Did you know that?

Dr. BALLOU. Well, I am not aware of all the assertions in that statement.

Mr. BLANTON. Are you aware of any of them?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir; because I think that all of the things that I am aware of would appear in the testimony before the Board of Education, when they conducted a hearing on Muzzey's History and filed a report with the Board, which the Board adopted. It is apparent from the fact that the committee of the Board that listened to that testimony was not impressed by it, and therefore did not agree with it.

Mr. BLANTON. And hundreds of such textbooks are now on hand in the Washington schools?

Dr. BALLOU. I think so; yes, sir.

COMMITTEE HAD TO USE CORKSCREW TO GET ANSWERS OUT OF DR. BALLOU

Mr. BLANTON. Are you aware that Dr. W. W. Charters rendered assistance to the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association, for which commission you were secretary for 5 years, and which "conclusions" were prepared by Dr. Counts and Dr. Beard, and the commission's gratitude in such connection is expressed on page 150 of said commission's Conclusions and Recommendations?

Dr. BALLOU. Well, yes; if it so states in the volume; but I would say further, if you asked me that outside of this connection, I should not know whether it was true or not. I do not know specifically what his participation in the work of that commission was.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, it does mention it on page 150, "Prof. W. W. Charters." Look at that volume, please [handing book to Dr. Ballou]. Does it not?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir. I am not denying that it says so. I am only asserting that I am not aware of the particular work he did for that commission.

Mr. BLANTON. I refer you to page 152, where it says that A. C. Krey and Frank W. Ballou served as chairman and secretary, respectively, of the commission throughout the 5-year period.

Dr. BALLOU. I served as secretary.

Mr. BLANTON. You served as secretary throughout the period?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir; 5 years.

Mr. BLANTON. There was a 5-year period in this course?

Dr. BALLOU. There was a 5-year period of investigation.

Mr. BLANTON. When did that begin, Doctor?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not remember. That volume would probably tell you.

Mr. BLANTON. It ended in December 1933, did it not?

Dr. BALLOU. I cannot answer that.

Mr. BLANTON. It ended before we ever appropriated any money for character education?

Dr. BALLOU. I could not answer that question.

TWO DIFFERENT 5-YEAR PROGRAMS HAPPENED TO COINCIDE

Mr. BLANTON. Dr. Charters said you and your corps of teachers had a 5-year program preceding October 1934. That commission did have a 5-year program, which ended December 1933, didn't it?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes; it had a 5-year program, and it happens perhaps, to be during the same period of time, but I would say that there is no more relationship between the work of that commission and the committee on character training in the Washington schools than there was between that commission and the proceedings in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. But, coincidentally, even though there might not have been any relationship between them there was a 5-year period during which you and this commission worked and also a 5-year period during which you and your corps of teachers in the Washington schools worked, and it happened to be the same 5 years, didn't it?

Dr. BALLOU. Approximately, I think so.

Mr. BLANTON. Approximately? That is close enough.

Dr. BALLOU. Yes; approximately, but so far as I know there was no relationship whatever between the two. Besides, the character education program was proposed to us. We did not originate the proposal. It was proposed to us.



## DR. BALLOU LETS CAT OUT OF BAG

Note that inadvertently, or otherwise, Dr. Ballou on cross-examination exclaimed, "We did not originate character education. It was proposed to us." Why, certainly! That was the object of that \$300,000 5-year "commission" of Dr. Charles A. Beard and Dr. George S. Counts (whom Dr. Ballou says are "radicals"), and for whom Dr. Ballou served as their secretary for 5 years, which ended in December 1933, and Dr. Ballou's character education began July 1, 1934.

And isn't it strange and unthinkable that all three of the experts to place in charge of "character education" here selected by Dr. Ballou and the Board of Education should be radicals? Dr. W. W. Charters and Dr. Charles R. Mann are in "the red network of radicals" and shown there to be connected with the Moscow University in Russia, and Dr. Charters and Dr. Ben D. Wood are found in Dr. Beard's Conclusions and Recommendations, as having rendered help to the commission in writing that "red" book.

## BALLOU ADMITS COUNTS AND BEARD WROTE "CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS"

Dr. Ballou contended that the book, Conclusions and Recommendations, published in 1934, was the result of 5 years' work of the Commission on the Social Studies, for which he was secretary, and which began its work January 1929 and ended in December 1933, and that Dr. George S. Counts and Dr. Charles A. Beard wrote this book, and because it was communistic he refused to sign it. I quote further from his testimony:

Mr. BLANTON. And yet, for 5 years, as secretary, you collaborated with him on this commission.

Dr. BALLOU. I did not have anything to do with the selection of the commission. I refused to sign the report which was written by Dr. Beard and Dr. Counts. I refused to sign it primarily just because of such statements as you are reading to me, with which I did not agree, as to his philosophy of history.

Mr. BLANTON. And yet you permitted your name to be published as secretary of the commission which he was serving?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes; I was a member of the commission, and I was also elected its secretary, and served for a period of 5 years.

Mr. BLANTON. You are aware, are you not, Dr. Ballou, that in the bulletin, Teacher Training in Service, issued by your head of the department of history of the Washington high schools, Professor Jones, your teachers have been told that every teacher's professional library should include the said final volume of report of Commission on the Social Studies entitled "Conclusions and Recommendations", which you say was prepared by Dr. Counts and Dr. Beard, instruction to that effect appearing at the top of page 3 of said bulletin?

Dr. BALLOU. I, myself, think it is desirable for the teachers to have that volume and to see what is in it. I think every teacher should keep herself familiar with the trends in history teaching.

Mr. JOHNSON. Have you pointed out to your teaching force those statements you believe in and those you do not agree with?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. JOHNSON. How could they distinguish between those you agree with and those with which you do not agree?

Dr. BALLOU. As a matter of fact, I do not think that is important from the standpoint of the outside literature which they read in the field of history, particularly disagreements between myself and Dr. Beard.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, from the first page to the last page in that volume, which it is recommended that your teachers should have in their professional library, there is not one single line that would indicate to any teacher reading it the things that you disagreed with in that volume?

Dr. BALLOU. No; not at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Not at all?

Dr. BALLOU. Not at all; no, sir. Neither is the commission responsible for what Dr. Beard said in that volume.

Mr. BLANTON. Nevertheless, all but four signed it. You are acquainted, are you not, with the following assertions on page 37 of your said commission's book, Conclusions and Recommendations:

"If education continues to emphasize the philosophy of individualism in economy, it will increase the accompanying social tensions. If it organizes a program in terms of a philosophy which harmonizes with the facts of a closely integrated society, it will ease the strains of the transition taking place in actuality. The making of choices cannot be avoided, for inaction in education is a form of action."

Dr. BALLOU. That is what I referred to a moment ago where doing nothing sometimes determines a course of procedure.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you agree with that?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not agree with the point of view expressed in this volume to which you refer.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me make this observation, Doctor: That book, Conclusions and Recommendations, was the summation of all of the work that you had done in 5 years, wasn't it, on that commission? That final volume was a summation of it?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir. I will say that was Mr. Beard's and Mr. Counts' summation.

Mr. BLANTON. You said awhile ago that the final conclusion or final volume was to be the main volume, didn't you?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And that all of the others were unimportant. It was the final volume that was important.

Dr. BALLOU. No; I did not say they were unimportant. I said that the commission itself assumed no responsibility for them.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but you said the final volume was to be the commission's conclusions.

Dr. BALLOU. What I did say was that this final volume was to be the volume of conclusions for which the commission was responsible.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to preface my question with the statement that I deem you one of the smartest and brightest men that I have ever seen in school life. Being that, Doctor, you knew that if you ever signed this report along with Counts and Beard and subscribed to the statements that they put down there in black and white, you knew that it would be impossible for you to continue holding your position, as superintendent of the Washington schools, didn't you?

Dr. BALLOU. No; I did not consider my position in the matter at all.

Mr. BLANTON. You realized that, didn't you, Doctor?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir; I do not think that is a fair statement for you to make.

Mr. BLANTON. If you were to subscribe to the principles enunciated by Beard and Counts and others in that summation and final report, did you think that the Washington people would have continued you in your position?

Dr. BALLOU. I cannot answer that. That was not the reason I did not sign.

Mr. BLANTON. If you had thought so—

Dr. BALLOU (interposing). I did not know whether they would or not.

Mr. BLANTON (continuing). You would not have agreed, of course?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not think any one act of any individual, unless it be murder or something of that sort, is likely to condemn him forever, either as a citizen or as an educational man.

Mr. DITTER. Treason is almost as bad as murder, though, Doctor, isn't it?

Dr. BALLOU. It is, sir; there is no question about that.

## DR. BALLOU PREFERRED NOT TO DISSENT

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1936.

MR. WILLIAM A. DUVALL,  
Clerk, Subcommittee on Appropriations for the  
District of Columbia, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I refer to your letter of February 13 about the volume, Conclusions and Recommendations, which forms a part of the report of the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association. You ask me to furnish you with any communication which Dr. Frank W. Ballou may have sent indicating his reasons for refusing to sign these conclusions and recommendations of the commission. Dr. Ballou was invited to state his reasons for dissent and facilities were offered to him for printing his dissenting opinion as an appendix to the book in question. He preferred not to do so.

Yours very truly,

CONYERS READ.

Instead of saying over his signature, where Counts, Beard, and others signed their names to said book: Conclusions and Recommendations "I dissent", or "I cannot sign this book", or "It is too communistic", to let all readers thereafter know that he did not approve of the book printed by his "commission", which was the product of its 5 years' work, and had cost \$300,000, and for which commission Dr. Ballou had served as its secretary for 5 years, Dr. Ballou preferred to be silent, say nothing, have his name printed on its front page, at the top of the list of sponsors, and then have it placed in his Washington schools as a textbook. No wonder Congressman DITTER spoke of treason.

## DR. BALLOU'S TESTIMONY

Mr. JOHNSON. You had been paid all of your expenses to all of the meetings prior thereto by the Historical Association?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir; out of this appropriation for the purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. We find out now, Doctor, that the life of your commission expired in December 1933, before this volume was printed, which was in 1934 following it.

Dr. BALLOU. The commission expired in 1933.

Mr. BLANTON. This was printed in 1934, this volume Conclusions and Recommendations, and your commission expired before those conclusions were printed.

Dr. BALLOU. Yes; I think it did; yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. So that it would be December 1933.

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, you are acquainted, are you not, with the assertion on page 83 of this book, Conclusions and Recommendations [reading]:



"In particular he, the teacher, will endeavor to acquaint the pupil with diverse ideas and points of view and cultivate in him a reasoned skepticism regarding the claims advanced in support of any social doctrine or program."

Dr. BALLOU. That is fraught with a lot of possibilities and interpretations, I should say.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, please refer to your school bulletin, The Past and the Present, on page 3, lines 18 and 25, issued by the head of the department of history in the Washington high schools, Professor Jones, wherein it is stated [reading]:

"The present wide-spread democratic order, of which we are a part, is only the third great attempt at sharing government with the people that the world has ever seen. No doubt this democratic order seems to you permanent now and destined to last for all times; but one thing you will learn from studying history is that that view is not a sound one. Democracy may last forever, and it may not. Rome lasted as a republic much longer than the United States has been a republic. This fact may help you to see the Roman failure at self-government in truer perspective."

This is quoted from Man's Achievement to The Age of Steam, by Edwin W. Pahlow, of Ohio State University.

Is this statement in said bulletin intended to create a skepticism regarding our Government, in obedience to A Charter for the Social Science, page 83 last quoted?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not think so, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. You are acquainted, are you not, with the assertion on page 133 of said book, Conclusions and Recommendations, published by your commission, that the individual teacher of social science instruction should be protected against the assaults of "ignorant majorities"?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes; I think they should be protected against the assault of anybody. I do not know what that statement means.

Mr. BLANTON. Does it mean that if the majority of the people of Washington wanted their children to be safe from communism here in the Washington schools that you ought to have protection from them?

Dr. BALLOU. Not at all.

Mr. BLANTON. What is meant by "the assault of ignorant majorities"?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know. You will have to ask the writer.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, you are acquainted, are you not, with the following statement on page 142 of said book of your commission, Conclusions and Recommendations [reading]:

"In the steadily integrating social order of the present and future, if education is to be given competent and relevant direction, the emphasis in the professional education of the administrator must be laid again on social science, social philosophy, and statecraft."

Dr. BALLOU. Who is the author of that statement?

Mr. BLANTON. That appears in Conclusions and Recommendations, at page 142.

Dr. BALLOU. Of course, I will admit I am familiar with every paragraph in the book. I have read it many times.

Mr. BLANTON. But that is a statement that you do not agree with? You can read it over. There is the paragraph.

Dr. BALLOU. No; I could not accept that.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not accept that, do you?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not also true, Doctor, that on June 5, 1935, on the recommendation of yourself, the Board of Education approved a revised course in history and other social studies, and that on the last page of such approved document, School Document No. 1, 1936, the following appears as one of the approved reading courses under heading [reading]:

"General Reference Readings on Methods for Teachers; Report of the Commission on the Social Studies; American Historical Association."

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir; I expect it is there.

Mr. JOHNSON. Then you did put this in as one of your approved books?

Dr. BALLOU. We put that in the list of books that would be of benefit to the teachers.

Mr. DITTER. Is it still there?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes; I expect it is still there.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, you recall, do you not, writing Mrs. E. N. Dingley, on February 11, 1935, that [reading]:

"The commission on the social studies of the American Historical Association, of which I was a member and which devoted 5 years to the study of this subject, was unanimously of the opinion that our study of history should increasingly have to do with the history of modern times as compared with the former emphasis on history of ancient times and should deal impartially and dispassionately with some of the current problems of economics and sociology. The commission recognized that in undertaking to do this it might be criticized for the way in which it dealt with the problems of capitalism, labor, and many patriotic subjects."

Dr. BALLOU. I recognize that.

Mr. BLANTON. You did write that?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes.

#### SCHOOL GIRL ASKED TO WRITE ESSAY ON SORDID SEX STORY

On page 571, hearings, you will find complaint made by Thomas W. Brahany on December 20, 1932, that his high-school daughter was required to write a summary of A Proudful Fellow, published in Scholastic on December 17, 1920, as a part of her English work, and that it was a "sordid sex story of negro life" wholly unsuitable for girls.

On February 7, 1932, Dr. Ballou replied:

I share with you the feeling that I should prefer not to have high-school pupils read this story. \* \* \* I think it unworthy to be carried in a journal of interest to high-school students.

Yet Dr. Ballou refused to remove Scholastic from the schools, and has several times defended it and its editor, his friend and collaborator, Dr. Harold Rugg (In Red Network), editing the social-studies column in Scholastic.

#### SORDID SEX STORY OF LOW CHINESE LIFE

On pages 572-573, hearings, you will find Dr. E. M. Ellison's complaint (Jan. 15, 1933), was required to read The Good Earth, stating:

It is a sordid story of low sex life of Chinese peasantry. I defy any teacher to prove to any thoughtful parent what benefit a girl 15 years old can derive from reading such stuff.

On February 7, 1933, Dr. Ballou filled Dr. Ellison's heart with satisfaction by writing that his investigation showed a desire on the part of teachers to require no reading of pupils to which any parent might make objection. No proper parent would want a 15-year-old daughter to read this sordid, vulgar, sex story of low, depraved Chinese.

Dr. BALLOU. I think the answer to your question in regard to this particular matter is this, that we undertake to select possible outside reading for them.

Mr. BLANTON. But the book The Good Earth is listed as one of your books?

Dr. BALLOU. It was listed?

Mr. BLANTON. Is it listed?

Dr. BALLOU. I don't know whether it is or not now.

Mr. BLANTON. He says it has a lot of vulgar stuff in it that nobody ought to read.

Dr. BALLOU. That no child ought to read; I agree with him.

Mr. BLANTON. As far as you know, that book is still listed by the schools?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know whether it is still listed or not.

I read the article that Mr. Brahany referred to, and I do not see why anyone would include it in such a magazine. The editor of Scholastic thought it was all right, but I differed with him on that.

Mr. BLANTON. And you would not have put it in there?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir; I would not have put it in that magazine.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, are you aware that this Dr. George S. Counts has written and published another book entitled "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?", in which he makes plain that his use of the term "democracy" is contrary to everything American, his assertions being—and I quote from page 28 of his book—"That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction."

I now quote the following from page 40:

"The conscious and deliberate achievement of democracy under novel circumstances is the task of our generation."

"Democracy, of course, should not be identified with political forms and functions—with the Federal Constitution, the popular election of officials, or the practice of universal suffrage."

Mr. BLANTON. On pages 41 and 42 I quote the following from Dr. Counts' book:

"Finally, be determined as a last resort, in either the defense or the realization of this purpose, to follow the method of revolution."

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, you do not agree with that kind of doctrine?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir; I do not agree even with the title of that pamphlet. I do not think it is a question of daring to do it. I do not think it is wise or proper for the educational profession to undertake to do it.

Mr. BLANTON. From page 10 I quote this:

"Mr. Lunacharsky, commissar of education in the Russian Republic until 1929, assured me on one occasion that the Soviet educational leaders do not believe in the indoctrination of children in the ideas and principles of communism. When I asked him whether their children become good Communists while attending the schools, he replied that a great majority do. On seeking from him an explanation of this remarkable phenomenon he said that Soviet teachers merely tell their children the truth about human history. As a consequence, so he asserted, practically all of the more intelligent boys and girls adopt the philosophy of communism."

In other words, he asserts that to make them Communists it is not necessary to indoctrinate them, but merely let the teachers teach factual history and they become Communists.

Dr. BALLOU. I do not believe that is so.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not agree with him on that?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir; I do not agree with him on that.

Mr. JOHNSON. And for 5 long years you were secretary of this set-up? Could you not see, when you were sitting around the table with these gentlemen, what was behind this whole thing?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir; and I do not think anybody else saw what was behind it; and I do not know what was behind it.

#### FENCING AND FUTILE DENIALS BY DR. BALLOU

I want any colleague who can to explain why Dr. Ballou was petulant and refused to answer pertinent questions and



tried to conceal facts, when he did not think they were known to the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. All of the radical views that are expressed in it now were in it in Chicago, when you met there?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not think so.

Mr. BLANTON. Can you tell us of one of them that was not in it?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know what radical views you refer to.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about the views such as that teachers should resort even to revolution to carry out their ideals.

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know where you find in that volume any such statement as that.

Mr. BLANTON. Inferentially it is in there.

Dr. BALLOU. Mr. Blanton, you must not put the information that you get from this book of Counts' over into this volume, which is the Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations. I do not think that statement about revolution is to be found in that volume of the Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, I think that your statement evidences the fact that I have given these volumes more careful, deliberative study than you have, probably.

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know what volumes you are referring to. I am talking about this final Conclusions and Recommendations.

Mr. BLANTON. Dr. George S. Counts in his book, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order*, on page 41, said, as follows:

"Finally be prepared as a last resort, in either the defense or the realization of this purpose, to follow the method of revolution."

Now, Doctor, there is a subversive magazine called *The Social Frontier* edited by George S. Counts, and a magazine called, *The Social Studies*, used by the teachers here, that have been prescribed in the schools for a number of years here in Washington.

Dr. BALLOU. Is that so?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, isn't that so?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not think so.

Mr. BLANTON. Are not those magazines used in your schools?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not think so.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, are they? I wish you would tell me whether they are or not.

Dr. BALLOU. Well, I will, if you will give me the opportunity.

Mr. BLANTON. It is reported to me that they are. I am asking you if that is so.

Dr. BALLOU. What are the titles?

Mr. BLANTON. The *Social Frontier* is the first I mentioned.

Dr. BALLOU. The *Social Frontier* is a magazine found in one of the teachers' colleges, in the library.

Mr. BLANTON. In Washington?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Then you were mistaken, Doctor, when you impulsively said that it was not in the schools here.

Dr. BALLOU. It is in that school.

Mr. BLANTON. Then you were mistaken, were you not?

Dr. BALLOU. Just a moment. I find that it is used by the teachers in one of the junior high schools also.

Mr. BLANTON. Then you were mistaken, and it is in those schools and is accessible to the teachers here?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. How about the *Social Studies*?

Dr. BALLOU. Who publishes the *Social Studies*?

Mr. BLANTON. The American Historical Association, for whose commission you were secretary for 5 years. I am assured on reliable authority that it is one of the magazines that is in the Washington school libraries, and it is the one which in his bulletin, *Teacher Training and Service*, page 2, your Professor Jones specially recommends it to teachers.

Dr. BALLOU. I do not doubt that they have access to it, anyway, whether it is in the schools or not.

Mr. BLANTON. What information have you got there about the magazine *Social Studies*?

Dr. BALLOU. That is what I am looking for, sir. I do not find the name "*Social Studies*" at all.

Mr. BLANTON. I see you were mistaken again, as the magazine *Social Studies* is one of your approved magazines.

No magazine can be prescribed for the Washington schools unless you finally authorize it, is not that so?

Dr. BALLOU. That is to be the policy in the future, but that has not been the policy in the past.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, you are responsible for what your assistant does, are you not?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And you assume responsibility?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Before any list of magazines goes to the finance office, they go through your assistant, do they not?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That is good.

Dr. BALLOU. That is exactly what I stated a moment ago, and now I would like to continue this matter. You asked me for this information, and I should like to furnish it now.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not ask you for a long treatise. I asked you to give this committee a list of the magazines that have been prescribed in the schools. I asked you to give this committee a list of magazines that have been authorized to be purchased in the schools. I asked you to give me a list of magazines that have been purchased by students through regular subscription, under recommendation from the teachers. I asked you to give us a list of the magazines that have been eliminated from the schools and the date they were eliminated.

That is plain, and if you can conform to that request, why, we are ready to proceed. But we want to conduct our investigation in our own way, and later we will hear you on other matters.

Now, this magazine, the *Social Frontier*, that is in your schools—and you finally admitted that it is—did you know that George S. Counts is the editor of that magazine?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir. I am familiar with that magazine. It comes to my desk every month.

Mr. BLANTON. And yet, not believing in George S. Counts' philosophy, you place his *Social Frontier* magazine, of which he is editor, in the schools.

Dr. BALLOU. I have not placed it in the schools.

Mr. BLANTON. But it is in the schools.

Dr. BALLOU. It has been in the schools.

Mr. BLANTON. And is now?

Dr. BALLOU. No. No magazines are being ordered since the 1st of January.

Mr. BLANTON. It has not been eliminated; it has not been taken out. You have just ordered no new ones.

Dr. BALLOU. All distribution of magazines is held up.

Mr. BLANTON. I could go up to that Wilson Teachers College right now and get that magazine, could I not?

Dr. BALLOU. I expect that you could.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Dr. BALLOU. But no orders are being placed and will not be placed until the officers have passed on every magazine that is in any way being used in the schools.

Mr. BLANTON. Since last December you have stopped the distribution of *Scholastics*?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Why?

Dr. BALLOU. Because of the complaints made against it.

Mr. BLANTON. You state that Members of Congress have asked you to discontinue it. What Members of Congress?

Dr. BALLOU. I prefer not to put that in the record.

I will direct your attention, Doctor, to the editorial on page 1 of *Scholastic*, issue of December 17, 1932, from which I quote the following excerpts:

"The national flower, says one headline writer, has become the 'razzberry.'"

"The mood of disillusionment has indeed settled over the present generation."

"A journalist who traveled the country over and talked with hundreds of ordinary, obscure men and women in all walks of life came back with a profound impression that the American people have no national faith."

Dr. BALLOU. Well, I do not agree with that point of view.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not agree with that, do you, Doctor?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. I direct your attention to the editorial note on page 7 of *Scholastics* magazine, issue of November 10, 1934, using the following language commendatory of the author of a recent book featured in such issue to this expression contained therein:

"Here in rigid logic he examines such popular belief as 'national honor', 'patriotism', 'security', and exposes their childishness and hypocrisy."

Do you consider that proper reading for our school children?

Dr. BALLOU. That is an unsound view to me.

Mr. BLANTON. It is unsound, isn't it, Doctor?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. I direct your attention to a special article in *Scholastics* magazine, issue of November 9, 1935, in which, on page 12, it is pointedly suggested that "the romantic appeal" is "a tricky lie", and that "a dirty trick is being played" upon those who respond to "some patriotic slogans." Do you think that is proper reading for school children?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know what is meant by "romantic appeal." I do not understand what that statement is all about.

Mr. BLANTON. All right, Doctor, if you want to let it go at that. If you can't understand it, how would the school children?

Dr. BALLOU. But I do not agree with the possible implications in it.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not agree with it?

Dr. BALLOU. No.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I was trying to get you to say.

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know that that does tell them how to think.

Mr. BLANTON. No; it is telling them what to think.

Dr. BALLOU. I do not believe in that.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not believe in it.

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I believe every member of this committee does not believe in.

Are you acquainted with the succession of articles in *Scholastics* magazine featuring Russian communism as elevating; for instance, I quote from the issue of December 16, 1933, page 16, where it says [reading]:

"Today 6,000,000 young Russians in the Communist Youth Association are helping to build a new social world."

I also quote from the issue of January 20, 1934, page 21 [continues reading]:

"But the Russian planters do not stop short with material things. It is a promise to increase the number of students in their country about 50 percent and reduce illiteracy by requiring every child to attend school at least 7 years."

"Can they do it? On the basis of past accomplishments, the answer is, 'Yes.'"



Then I quote from the issue of October 6, 1934, page 12, the following [continues reading]:

"The older transients, it is true, resist communism. They have a mental hold-over of war psychology, the antired drives of former, and a belief in the American success story. For boys and girls, communism offers school, hope, and adventure."

The issue of January 4, 1936, on page 23, expressly commends the procommunist book, *I Write as I Please*, by Walter Durante, as "dynamic, objective, and reliable about the Soviet experiment."

Have those matters been brought to your attention by any parent, Congressman, or anybody else, about the Scholastic magazine?

MR. BLANTON. You know, Doctor, do you not, that this same Harold Rugg, who is social-studies editor of Scholastic magazine, has written and published a book called *The Great Technology*? You know that book, don't you, *The Great Technology*?

DR. BALLOU. That is the book, right there, or it looks like that one.

MR. BLANTON. Now, I quote from page 95 of that book [reading]: "Nothing about this story of degradation is clearer than that in any of those decades a fairly decent standard of living could have been had by the peoples of the expanding West. That it was not and is not today can be traced primarily to the theory and practice of government set up by our fathers."

Further quoting from page 234, it states [continues reading]: "School administrators and teachers should lead actively in the formation of public opinion."

Further quoting from pages 259 and 260, it states [continues reading]:

"It is this which compels the formal, unthinking salute to the flag, and the mumbling of an oath of allegiance which means absolutely nothing to the young people making it. It is this, which, in hundreds of communities, compels teachers to sign oaths of allegiance to swear that they will protect the written Constitution of the United States."

In other words, it states that when a teacher takes an oath, he mumbles it, and it means nothing.

MR. BLANTON. Do you know that Prof. Carl Becker has any personal knowledge of conditions in Soviet Russia, either at present or at any time in the past?

DR. BALLOU. No, sir; I do not.

MR. BLANTON. Are you familiar with what is said with respect to Marxist communism and Soviet Russia in Carl Becker's textbook, *Modern History*, still in use in the Washington high schools; the laudation of Marxist communism, commencing on page 534, and Soviet Russia being featured (commencing on p. 790) as having become "every year more popular" (p. 799), following a laudation of Lenin as a great leader "in the crusade for human freedom" (p. 791); and are you aware that the said textbook makes no disclosure of the subversive nature of the Soviet Government directed against our own Government through the Third Internationale, and substitutes for an explanation of the enslaving features of Russian communism a misdescription of Russian communism as something elevating and popular?

DR. BALLOU. I am not familiar with the matter.

MR. BLANTON. Carl Becker's textbook, *Modern History*, is still in use in the schools here; is not that a fact?

DR. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

MR. BLANTON. The Board of Education approved it upon your recommendation?

DR. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

MR. BLANTON. If you had not recommended it, they would not have approved it?

DR. BALLOU. No.

MR. BLANTON. I hand you a printed brief of 45 pages of printed matter entitled "Piney Branch Citizens' Association against the Muzzey School History", a brief for the association, which is signed by S. T. Cameron, Ralph V. Hendrick, and C. R. Thompson for the Piney Branch Citizens' Association, of Washington, D. C., dated April 25, 1923. That shows that the people were sufficiently interested at that time to take this matter up and protest against this Muzzey School History.

When did you come to the schools here?

DR. BALLOU. 1920.

MR. BLANTON. That was 3 years after you came here. That group, the Piney Branch Citizens' Association, went to the trouble and expense of having a 45-page brief printed against that Muzzey's History. You had a copy of it filed with you, didn't you?

DR. BALLOU. The Board of Education had it filed with them.

MR. BLANTON. Did you ever see it before?

DR. BALLOU. Yes. I heard Mr. Cameron read it in a meeting before the Board of Education. He practically read that whole statement or brief.

MR. BLANTON. He made them sit there and listen to it?

DR. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

MR. BLANTON. And required you to do it, didn't he, Doctor?

DR. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

MR. BLANTON. It was quite an imposition on you?

DR. BALLOU. Yes, sir; it was an amusing experience. I do not think it was very favorably considered by the Board.

MR. BLANTON. Dr. Ballou, would the Board of Education, from the intimate relationship that exists between you and it, go against your recommendation on anything?

DR. BALLOU. I cannot answer that, sir.

#### HAMILTON FISH COMMITTEE'S DEFINITION

The following is a definition of communism, a world-wide political organization advocating:

- (1) Hatred of God and all forms of religion.
- (2) Destruction of private property and inheritance.
- (3) Absolute social and racial equality; promotion of class hatred.
- (4) Revolutionary propaganda through the Communist International, stirring up Communist activities in foreign countries in order to cause strikes, riots, sabotage, bloodshed, and civil war.
- (5) Destruction of all forms of representative or democratic governments, including civil liberties, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and trial by jury.
- (6) The ultimate and final objective is by means of world revolution to establish the dictatorship of the so-called proletariat into one world union of soviet socialist republics with the capital at Moscow.

To the above experts on communism have later added:

- (7) Destruction of all forms of morality, especially breaking down sex morality in children.

"AS GIVING IN TO THESE PEOPLE WHO HAVE ACCUSED US OF COMMUNISM"

The Washington Post, February 18, 1936, under headline: "Head of Scholastic Magazine appears before School Principals", said:

A defiant challenge to red-rider proponents was hurled yesterday by Maurice R. Robinson. If you want to drop the magazine from your course of study for technical reasons, that is your privilege. However, if you do that, let me urge you to take such action, let us say, next year, so that it will not be interpreted as giving in to these people who have accused us of communism.

Dr. Ballou and his board of education know that every member of our subcommittee reached the unanimous conclusion that Scholastic is unfit to be in any school course of study, and totally unfit for school children to read, yet they follow Editor Robinson and not a committee of Congress.

#### COMMITTEE GAVE "CHARACTER EDUCATION" EXHAUSTIVE INVESTIGATION

Before denying the \$78,660 Dr. Ballou requested for his so-called character education, our subcommittee gave the matter an exhaustive hearing, covering 268 printed pages. No more copies are now obtainable. Additional copies would have been printed but for the objection of communistic sympathizers. The Government Printing Office has this type intact. It can print additional copies for \$185.78 for the first thousand, and \$84.04 for each additional thousand. Some should go into every one of the 48 States. I would have additional copies printed at my own expense, but I am not financially able to do it. During my 20 years in Congress, outside of a bare living for my family and educating my children, I have spent my entire income in public service, trying to help make the United States a more decent place for a poor man to live in. The people of the United States have an inherent right to know of the efforts and activities exerted by radicals to communize the United States, through their school system. Communists do not want these facts known. They will attack me for making this speech, and claim that it cost money to print it, and that it cost money to print our hearings, but they will not mention that the action of our subcommittee caused \$78,660 to be saved in cash this year, and will save more than that each year hereafter, from the money standpoint alone, besides being worth many billions of dollars in preventing the communizing of our school children. If I were financially able, I would place a copy of this speech in every home in the United States, to warn Americans of this serious menace in growing communism.

#### URGE COLLEAGUES TO READ HEARINGS

Each Member of the House and Senate has been furnished with a copy of the hearings sent to their office. I ask them to read the 101 pages of Dr. Ballou's testimony; the 22 pages of Professor Jones' testimony; the opinion and testimony of Corporation Counsel Prettyman; the statement of Mrs. Henry Grattan Doyle, president of the Board of Education; the 25 pages of Hon. George E. Sullivan, as the spokesman for the Federation of Citizens Associations, showing their discoveries of communism in Washington schools and their untiring efforts to eradicate it; the 35 pages of Maj. Gen. Amos A. Fries' testimony, he being the spokesman of the District of Columbia Public School Association, embracing 90 organizations in Washington, and also the spokesman of the American Legion; the 14 pages of Representatives VIRGINIA E. JENCKES' testimony; the evidence of Lt. Horace Lineburg, head of the



crime-prevention bureau of the Metropolitan Police and a former president of the Police Association, who testified "there is a Communist School in Washington, teaching straight-out communism of the Third Internationale, known and advertised publicly, and that from his official knowledge there is a direct tie-up, a direct connection, between communists, this communist school, and the meetings where rioting and unlawful assembly have occurred in Washington during the last 3 years"; the evidence of Fred G. Lange, giving his 2¾ years' experience in Russia; the report of the Civic Council of Defense of California, Inc., showing the subversive activities of Scholastic; the 51 pages of the Scholastic editor's testimony and other pertinent evidence, showing that, although he was in Washington 2 days during said hearings and we urged him to come before us, Dr. W. W. Charters refused to testify and refused to allow us to ask him any questions.

#### DETERMINED NATIONAL LOBBY TO REPEAL "RED RIDER"

There is a determined national lobby working day and night to repeal the law which prevents communism from being taught in Washington schools, and to have the \$78,660 placed in the bill for so-called character education, under which cloak they expect subversive doctrines to continue to be taught in Washington schools.

MINUTES, BOARD OF EDUCATION, MARCH 6, 1935

Moved, seconded, and carried:

"That in view of the fact that the Board of Education has heard the correspondence between Dr. W. W. Charters and Dr. Frank W. Ballou as to the charges that Dr. Charters is connected with Soviet Russia, and in view of the further fact that the Board found this correspondence satisfactory in every way, the Board passes a vote of confidence in Dr. Charters" (p. 14).

NEWS SAYS "COMMUNISTS OPPOSE 'RED RIDER'"

The Washington Daily News, a pink paper sympathetic to communism, in its issue of March 2, 1936, under large headlines, "Communists Oppose School 'Red Rider'", said:

Communists in Washington in a statement issued today endorsed the Sisson bill repealing the Blanton "red rider." Representative MAVERICK (Texas) and SCOTT (California) are expected to continue arguments for the bill.

#### LOBBYING AND PROPAGANDA BY TEACHERS

The Education Association of the District of Columbia is a teachers' organization, composed of teachers, its president being in charge of one of its schools. The following is a propaganda circular which its officers (teachers) mailed to many prominent citizens in Washington yesterday, lobbying for the Sisson bill:

EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1936.

To Members of the Delegate Council:

The meeting of the delegate council held last evening served to impress upon those present the need for immediate and united action if we are to secure the elimination of the "red rider." Each representative was urged to call his group together and ask all members to see personally one or more Washington citizens outside of our profession, asking them to telephone, interview, or write members of the two committees to report out and pass the second Sisson bill, H. R. 11375. Remember that it is the second Sisson bill not the first that we want passed. The names of the members of the two committees are given below. This is not just "one more thing." It is fundamentally important to the schools of Washington and the Nation.

District of Columbia House Committee: Mary T. Norton (chairman), New Jersey; Vincent L. Palmisano, Maryland; Wright Patman, Texas; Ambrose J. Kennedy, Maryland; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; Virginia E. Jenckes, Indiana; Theo. B. Werner, South Dakota; Randolph Carpenter, Kansas; Henry Ellenbogen, Pennsylvania; William T. Schulte, Indiana; Reuben T. Wood, Missouri; James L. Quinn, Pennsylvania; Jack Nichols, Oklahoma; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; Merlin Hull, Wisconsin; Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; Dewey Short, Missouri; Ralph O. Brewster, Maine; Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; Clare G. Fenerty, Pennsylvania; and W. Sterline Cole, New York.

Senate Committee on Education and Labor: David I. Walsh (chairman), Massachusetts; Royal S. Copeland, New York; Park Trammell, Florida; Hugo L. Black, Alabama; Louis Murphy, Iowa; Elbert Thomas, Utah; James E. Murray, Montana; Vic Donahey, Ohio; Rush D. Holt, West Virginia; William E. Borah, Idaho; Jesse H. Metcalf, Rhode Island; Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Wisconsin; and James J. Davis, Pennsylvania.

Very sincerely yours,

EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

The Washington Daily News, March 24, 1936, under heading running across entire page, "Civil Liberties Group De-

mands Red Rider Repeal," and a subhead "Representatives MAVERICK and SCOTT Flay Teacher Oath Requirement", said:

Rarely has the "red rider" taken such a knocking about as it received last night at the hands of Representatives MAURY MAVERICK and BYRON SCOTT at the first meeting of the Washington branch of the American Civil Liberties Union.

#### AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION BECOMES ACTIVE

The following circular was distributed all over Washington on March 22, 1936:

The "red rider" and the challenge to American civil liberties. Shall the rider to the appropriation bill prohibiting teachers from "teaching or advocating communism" in the District schools be repealed? Symposium by Congressman MAURY MAVERICK, of Texas; Congressman BYRON SCOTT, of California, and Congressman KNUTE HILL, of Washington. Monday evening, March 23, 8 o'clock. Friends' Meeting House, 2111 Florida Avenue NW. Auspices Washington, D. C., Committee, American Civil Liberties Union.

#### WHAT HAMILTON FISH COMMITTEE REPORTED TO CONGRESS

The American Civil Liberties Union is closely affiliated with the Communist movement in the United States, and fully 90 percent of its efforts are on behalf of Communists who have come in conflict with the law. It claims to stand for free speech, free press, and free assembly, but it is quite apparent that the main function of the American Civil Liberties Union is to attempt to protect the Communists in their advocacy of force and violence to overthrow the Government.

#### WHAT THE NEW YORK STATE LUSK REPORTS SAID

The American Civil Liberties Union, in the last analysis, is a supporter of all subversive movements; its propaganda is detrimental to the State. It attempts not only to protect crime, but to encourage attacks upon our institutions in every form.

#### ABOUT ITS LEADER, ROGER N. BALDWIN

The January 1931 report to Congress said:

Roger N. Baldwin, the guiding spirit of the American Civil Liberties Union, makes no attempt to hide his friendship for the Communists and their principles. He was formerly a member of the I. W. W., and served a term in prison as a draft dodger during the war. Testifying on force and violence, murder, and so forth, said:

The CHAIRMAN. Does your organization uphold the right of a citizen or alien to advocate murder?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Or assassination?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does your organization uphold the right of an American citizen to advocate force and violence for the overthrow of the Government?

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly; insofar as mere advocacy is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. You do uphold the right of an alien to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?

Mr. BALDWIN. Sure; certainly.

The Red Network says that the American Civil Liberties Union centers its fight against the American Legion and the Daughters of the American Revolution "as they are the most active inciters against radicals."

Can there be found anywhere in the United States two more loyal or more patriotic organizations than the American Legion and the Daughters of the American Revolution? I say there cannot. The above two organizations stand out as two worthy, reliable, loyal, patriotic, and dependable American institutions.

N. E. A.

The Washington Post on February 26, 1936, in reporting proceedings of the National Education Association, reported Dr. Charles A. Beard in making a vicious attack upon William Randolph Hearst and of injecting politics in the convention.

The Post quoted Dr. Charles A. Beard as saying that Landon would have an excellent chance of being the Republican candidate for President if Hearst had not sponsored him, and that Dr. Beard used the expression, "every scoundrel like Hearst and his satellites."

Dr. Beard was reported to have denounced the dismissal of Payson Smith, commissioner of education in Massachusetts, against whom complaint was made that he opposed the law requiring teachers to take an oath of allegiance and of his having religious bias and favoring out-of-State teachers and fiscal waste.

The sole reason why Dr. George S. Counts and Dr. Charles A. Beard viciously attacked Hearst and Hearst's papers at this convention of the National Education Association is that Hearst has been making a determined, uncompromising fight against communism and their subversive activities now be-



ing exerted in an attempt to overthrow this Government by force and violence.

The Washington Herald for March 25, 1936, in reporting the convention of the National Education Association, under headlines "Red teachers fail to force ban on loyalty" and "Convention backs academic freedom", said:

Communitic-inclined educators failed to force a stand against legislation requiring teachers to pledge loyalty to the Constitution.

While "left wing" educators claimed victory over conservatives on the issue of "academic freedom", they rejected any plan to fight the proposed teachers' oath.

In another column the Herald carried the Washington headlines, "School Board ignores plea for 'red' curb" and "No action taken on appeal by lawyer for 'red rider'", said:

Throwing their support behind the Sisson bill for repeal of the "red rider", members of the Board of Education yesterday ignored the argument of Roscoe F. Walter, who was there to urge opposition to the bill. Roscoe said, "There are many teachers who do not live up to the oath, and we know it."

In the Washington Post for February 27, 1936, the following reference is made to the hearing on the Sisson bill, which attempts to repeal the law now preventing indoctrinating communism in Washington schools:

Among the Congressmen who will speak in favor of the Sisson bill on Monday are Representatives FRED J. SISSON, of New York, author of the bill; MAURY MAVERICK, of Texas; and BYRON SCOTT, of California.

And editorially, like an ostrich with his head in the sand, or an irresponsible idiot, the Post then editorially blatantly said:

Teachers must not be bullied by morons and "red" baiters to debauch local schools.

The Washington Herald for Thursday, February 27, 1936, carried a report from Modesto, Calif., that District Attorney Cleary had asked President Sproul, of the University of California, to dismiss two professors because of their communistic activities in addressing Communists meeting and consorting with such Communists as Harry Bridges and Ella Winters. The Herald also reported that W. P. A. Directors Barrett and White in Atlanta, Ga., had refused to spread communistic propaganda through W. P. A. teachers, and that a W. P. A. handbook given out to workers at Macon, Ga., suggested as reading material to them radical and communistic literature, such as Rebel America, and the Challenge of Russia, and Mill Shadows, and Anthology of Revolutionary Poetry, and Red Bread, and that instead of spreading such communistic literature with the help of Superintendent Collins they had drafted a proper course in patriotic history, English, and other standard subjects to supplant the communistic works which W. P. A. teachers had been trained to hand out.

The Fortnightly for Teachers and Principals, called "High School", which is combined with the High School Teacher, is published at Pittsburgh, Pa., by Scholastic Corporation as one of the Scholastic publications, Scholastic being another. Heading its list of editors under "editorial department" is Maurice R. Robinson, editor of Scholastic.

In its issue of March 21, 1936, under heading John Dewey Society Hears Counts Rip Into Critics of Free Schools, on its front page said:

One thousand guests of the newly organized John Dewey Society, successor to the Social Frontier group, met in St. Louis just before the opening of the N. E. A. superintendents' convention last month to hear an address by George S. Counts, Teachers College, Columbia.

Essentially the same group which last year heard Charles A. Beard, venerable historian, take the hide off William Randolph Hearst this year heard Mr. Counts pay respects to the Daughters of the American Revolution, Frank Belgrano, former American Legion chief, and Alfred E. Smith: "Hearst prefers a sales tax"; "Belgrano is willing to cooperate with Hearst in pinning the Communist label on ministers, teachers, journalists, and others who advocate a humane civilization"; "Smith wants people to believe that God guides the Supreme Court"; and "The Daughters of the American Revolution betray their fathers, their patriotism being thinly veiled snobbery."

In the first column on the first page of said issue the following startling admonition is given:

Teachers must ally themselves with organized labor.

And on its front page in another column it was asserted that Norman Thomas (a well-known radical) won his debate at this N. E. A. convention in St. Louis and that attending superintendents entered a vigorous defense of "academic freedom" in Washington, D. C., and stated that a high spot was Dr. Charles A. Beard's presentation of the superintendents' 1936 yearbook.

On its editorial page M. R. Robinson (editor of Scholastic) editorially commented on the N. E. A. convention at St. Louis, and said:

The tremendous applause at the end of Norman Thomas' dynamic rebuttal was headlined in all the St. Louis newspapers.

And called attention to the fact that more than 1,000 attended the organization meeting of the John Dewey Society, and that "the naming of public enemies of education by Prof. George Counts was a poor substitute for the expected speech of Governor La Follette."

Robinson said that the meeting "deserves one rousing cheer for the suggestion of William McAndrew that teachers propose an oath of their own writing."

And then Robinson said:

Dr. Beard's telegram to Governor Landon asking if he were proud of Hearst's support of his candidacy added merriment to the hotel lobby talk.

On page 5 it is stated:

Superintendents of the National Education Association officially oppose the District of Columbia rule, supported by the American Legion, which forbids any person teaching or advocating communism.

On page 6, under the Social Studies column, in an apparent attempt to incite sympathy for strikes, High School said:

When times are getting better and the price of living is rising, strikes become frequent and bitter. We are now in such a period.

The average wage in industry is \$22 a week, a sum so small that most families cannot live on it decently. To get better wages they must bargain collectively; strikes are the result.

Interview owners and workers in your town. What have they done? Are there any strong craft unions in your vicinity? Do many of the unskilled men belong to industrial unions? Are company unions working? What do you expect the Supreme Court to decide about the Wagner-Connery labor bill?

When at Alameda, Calif., on March 5 to 7, 1936, the school children walked out on a strike, Communists distributed "red" handbills stating:

The Communists League of California is behind you 100 percent. Keep up the good work. Stay on strike.

The American Citizen, published at San Rafael, Calif., in its issue of March 27, 1936, under headlines, State Teachers Federation Looks "Red", said:

Add the California Federation of Teachers to the list of 180 Communists or Communist-controlled organizations active in the San Francisco Bay district.

The federation unanimously endorsed resolutions favoring repeal of the State criminal syndicalism act, abolition of military training, freedom of Tom Mooney, and reinstatement of high-school teacher, Victor Jewett.

It speaks of the Berkeley chapter of the American Students Union as "a radical left-wing organization, formed in Ohio in December."

It further states that the American Legion has demanded that well-known agent agitators and Communists be removed from W. P. A. rolls, asserting that several of them are receiving maximum salaries, stating:

"Jack Warnick, 28, now facing deportation as an undesirable alien, who is receiving \$94 a month as an 'artist' on the Federal theater projects; William A. Boeker, said to have served as secretary of the Friends of the Soviet Union, now employed at top salary on a project at Seventh and Bryant Streets; and J. B. Nathan, said to have been active in the San Joaquin Valley agricultural troubles, employed on the Federal writers' project at Berkeley.

The March 1936 issue of the National Republic, a magazine of fundamental Americanism, sounds the following warning:

The Soviet Government is a conspirator and breeder of revolts in every nation of the world. Moscow still directs the conspiracy for world revolution.

In the United States the Bolsheviks have made considerable headway since the Moscow Congress last year. Relief centers have afforded not only ready prospects for the conspirators, but also a



source of increased revenue for Communist activities. Strikes, riots, and mass demonstrations have become more frequent. Communists have become bolder and more optimistic over prospects of ultimate success.

Evidence has been uncovered which proves that Soviet agents have been the instigators of scores of revolutions in all parts of the world. China made charges following the raid on trade agencies. Great Britain made charges after raids on the Arcos. Germany made charges after the round-up of scores of Soviet conspirators. Mexico broke relations and deported Ambassador Kollontoy.

Russia claims that when a country breaks relations, it is an act of war, tending to force nations to maintain relations, even though they disapprove of Russia's conspiring and intrigues.

Police in Rio de Janeiro recently arrested Harry Berger and Machia Lueszkyl, for fomenting Communist disorders, they being sent there by Russia.

In Spain recently the revolutionists were victorious in battle and ballot, and taking control, Communists burned churches and buildings, opened prisons, and turned thousands of vicious characters loose to plunder.

Chile discovered a Communist plot for a railroad strike to envelop industries, and over 200 revolutionary Communist leaders and organizers were arrested.

In Mexico, Communists were foiled in their attempt to seize factories in Monterey.

From the seeds planted by Communists at Howard University (in Washington, D. C., maintained by Government funds) there developed the National Negro Congress held in Chicago, last month, with 4,000 Negroes attending. Its speakers were Anglo Herndon, Georgian Communist; John Phillips, of the (Communistic) Friends of Chinese People; James Ford, Communist candidate for President; Edward Strong, and Norman Thomas. The well-known Communist, Earl Browder, national secretary of the Communist Party, was scheduled to speak. Philip Randolph, well-known Negro radical, was elected national chairman.

People must not be ostrichlike and bury their heads so as to pooch-pooch the seriousness of the revolutionistic movement among the youth. Lenin once said that if children were given over to the Communists for a short while at the age of 8, they could make Bolsheviks of them for life. Communist agents in America are feverishly working to influence the youth in the schools, on and off the campus, through books, newspapers, magazines, bulletins, and by pacifist movements. They frequently disguise their activities by a slight garnish of patriotism, religion, or humanitarianism. It matters little to them what bait is used, so long as they hook their suckers.

The newest radical movement among youth is the American Student Union. It was organized at a national meeting of Socialists and Communists, at which the American flag was not in sight. The meeting was concluded with the singing of the Communist anthem, the red Internationale, and pledged to defend Soviet Russia.

The American Student Union is active in many schools, colleges, and universities at present, and announces that it will organize a Nation-wide student strike to take place on April 22.

Meyer Schapiro, a teacher at Columbia University, addressed the convention of radical artists in New York on February 16.

Over 1,500 recruits were enrolled in the Communist Party in its recent memorial meeting to Lenin in Madison Square Garden. The Communist organizer, Isreal Amter, opened the meeting with a tribute to "Our dead leader, Comrade Lenin." Earl Browder, Communist secretary, was cheered uproariously, and led them in the Communist pledge.

In Washington, D. C., and elsewhere Communists are trying to slip their propaganda plays into Federal projects. The Private Hicks was barred, but sponsored for showing at the National Press Club Auditorium later by Congressman Scott. In Plymouth, Mass., another radical play has been stopped. School children had been ordered to attend it.

The Washington Herald for February 26, 1936, quotes the following from the proceedings of the District subcommittee, holding hearings on the Sisson bill, which seeks to repeal the law preventing indoctrinating communism in Washington schools:

Mrs. JENCKES said: "As a member of the subcommittee on education, I have requested that the hearings be extended and continued in order that I might file a brief, which will show that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia is wholly unfit to administer the sacred trust of educating the children of the District.

Dr. Frank W. Ballou offered a number of telegrams from educators advocating repeal of the anti-Communist law, quoting Dr. Ballou as follows: "I want to impress on you gentlemen that what we are doing is being watched by the educational system of Texas."

Concerning the above, the Washington Herald editorially then said:

These words from School Superintendent Ballou should have been supplemented with: "And by every father and mother in America."

Every parent in the land is watching the school board's attempt to throw the schoolhouse doors open to the teaching of communism.

Congress, listening to pleas pro and con on the "red rider", should ask itself: "Do I want my children taught communism?"

When abstract theorizing is changed to a question in one's own hearth and home, vitally affecting one's own future and one's national future, it becomes a different matter.

A vote for the existing law is a vote against communism.

#### HEARINGS TO REPEAL LAW STOPPING COMMUNISM

It is reported that the hearings before the legislative subcommittee on the Sisson bill to repeal the law stopping communism in the Washington schools will approximate almost 300 printed pages. When the hearings first started on February 25, 1936, Chairman KENNEDY said:

Unless there is objection on the part of members of the subcommittee, we will hear from the proponents of the bill, but not from the opponents.

Author Sisson at that time declined to make a statement. The Washington Herald for February 25, 1936, quoted Congressman VIRGINIA JENCKES as follows:

Mrs. JENCKES said this (Communist) school would like to have the Board of Education lighten its task by teaching fundamentals of communism in public school classrooms, so it could devote its full time to postgraduate courses in violence and revolution.

Mrs. JENCKES said: "This communistic school operates in the rear of a book shop in the 500 block of F Street NW. The Daily Worker and other communistic literature is dispensed in the book shop.

"The school, although supposedly financed locally, I have learned, is but a link in a Nation-wide chain of such institutions. In these schools originate communistic marches. Riots and other forms of violence against constituted authority are plotted in them.

"Indoctrination of the immature minds of children in the Nation's Capital with the brutal, irreligious, and revolutionary philosophy of the Soviet Government already has gone too far.

"Speaking as a mother, I would not permit a child of mine to attend schools administered by the Board of Education which admittedly recently ordered teachers to use a textbook openly advocating communism and refused to withdraw the book until the subversive propaganda it contained had been exposed to the public."

On another page the Herald publishes an account of a visit by one of its reporters to a Communist book store in Washington, and under the following headlines: Soviet Gospel Preached Here in Book Store, and Communists Hold Forth in Shadow of Supreme Court; \$2 and \$3 Courses Offered, said:

Communism—taught within a stone's throw of the District Supreme Court.

Classes in communism, with youthful residents of the District sitting in as students being taught the doctrines of Lenin and Marx in the rear of a book store in the Nation's Capital.

This was revealed last night when a Washington Herald reporter wandered into the establishment. Under casual questioning it was explained that classes were just being organized on the red doctrine. Both colored and white persons are eligible to enroll. Stickers in the shop bore the inscription "Don't read Hearst", who was described as the greatest enemy to communism in the United States.

The Communist in charge expressed high hope that the rider prohibiting the teaching or advocacy of communism in the District schools will be repealed.

The Washington Post for February 25, 1936, under large headlines, "Red Activities Laid to Two Seized on Battleship" and "Women Arrested on Coast Linked to Wide Subversive Campaign", said:

A widespread campaign of young radicals to salt the United States Battle Fleet with communistic propaganda was believed uncovered tonight following the arrest of two women aboard the battleship *Mississippi*.

Naval and Federal authorities said they had five other persons, including two women, under surveillance, in a move to balk efforts of young radical groups to breed disloyalty among men in the fleet.

Concealed copies of a pamphlet urged sailors to join the Third International, International Communist Party. It contained articles attacking the naval service and reviling officers, urging sailors not to reenlist.

Officers connect the spread of propaganda with efforts to sabotage naval and military aircraft operations in this area, including the Vultee bombing plane September 13, when Pilot Blue and Fred Stone, crack Navy flyer, were killed, and the disappearance July 30 of the fastest military airplane in the world and its pilot, Lieutenant Skaer.

The Washington Times for February 26, 1936, reported that executive officers of the United States Fleet ordered watch "for women and girls instructed by Communists to meet sailors, take them to dances and entertainments, win their confidence, and then preach to them the red doctrines."



## WASHINGTON BOARD OF EDUCATION BEEN ABOLISHED TWICE

The legislative history of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia is as follows:

First. As appears from Compiled Statutes, District of Columbia, chapter LVII, page 482, Public Schools, sections 1 and 2: The "Board of School Trustees", existing prior to July 1, 1878, was abolished by act of June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 107), and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia were, by said act, empowered to appoint nine persons to constitute "the Trustees of Public Schools" of the District of Columbia.

Second. As appears from District of Columbia Code, Revised, title 7, Education, page 75, Congress passed an act on June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), vesting so-called control of the public schools of the District of Columbia "in a board of education" to consist of nine members, appointed by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. This last-named legislation was evidently drafted for the purpose of giving the new body called Board of Education merely nominal control, the actual, effective control being vested in a "superintendent of schools." This is made manifest by the provision in section 2 of the act prohibiting said Board from making any appointment, promotion, transfer, or dismissal "except upon the written recommendation of the superintendent of schools", and also by the express provision in section 3 restricting the power of removal by the Board of Education of such all-powerful superintendent to "adequate cause affecting his character and efficiency."

An act would seem to be in order at this time similar to the one passed June 11, 1878, abolishing the then Board of School Trustees, which would now abolish the Board of Education. Such an act might read, in substance, as follows:

SECTION 1. That from and after the 1st day of July 1936 the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall be abolished, and all the powers and duties now conferred upon such Board shall be transferred to a new board, to be known as the Board of School Trustees, and to consist of nine members having the same qualifications and terms of office as required for said abolished Board of Education, but to be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. Said Board of School Trustees shall have power to remove the Superintendent of Schools at any time, in its discretion, without any special showing or cause. The Board shall also have power to make appointments, promotions, transfers, or dismissals of any director, supervising principal, principal, head of department, teacher, or any other subordinate to the Superintendent of Schools, in accord with its discretion or judgment, whether in accord with or opposed to a recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools.

## COMMISSIONERS SHOULD APPOINT BOARD OF EDUCATION

As it is, the Board of Education assumes that it is responsible to nobody. If it were appointed by the Commissioners, as all other District officials are, this Board of Education would not be so autocratic and irresponsible to the wishes of the citizens living in the District of Columbia.

## NOW ALL POWERFUL SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Under the present law you will have noted that, except for "adequate cause affecting his character and efficiency", the Board of Education has no power to remove the Superintendent. Also, you will have noted, probably much to your surprise, that under section 2 of the present law, the Board of Education "is prohibited from making any appointment, promotion, transfer, or dismissal, except upon the written recommendation of the Superintendent."

## PERSONS EXECUTED BY THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

General FRIES. Now, here is a paragraph from the Army Chaplain of October 1935. That is a paper published by the Army chaplains of the Regular Army, the Reserves, the National Guard, and includes ministers of the Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, and Jewish faiths. I make that statement to show that the magazine is non-sectarian in the broadest sense. The article is nearly two columns long, but I will only read the first paragraph. It is entitled "Russia Is Red—Blood Red."

"Henri Bero, a French Socialist, has gathered figures showing that the number of people who have been killed or executed since the Soviet regime came into power in Russia is almost unbelievable. His figures of the known dead are as follows:

"Twenty-eight bishops and higher clergy, 6,778 priests, 6,585 school teachers, 8,000 doctors, 51,850 army officers, 200,850 policemen and other officials, and 11,483,520 peasants and artisans. These make the staggering total of 11,726,746. Nearly 2,000,000 more dead than the total killed in the World War."

Mr. BLANTON. You mean 2,000,000 more were executed in Russia than were killed in the World War?

General FRIES. He so states.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

General FRIES. That has nothing to do with the 20,000,000 that died of starvation.

## POVERTY AND STARVATION IN RUSSIA

In Ripley's broadcast "I Saw Starvation in Russia", April 5, 1935, he said:

Russia is a gigantic poorhouse where millions of people are on the verge of starvation at this moment \* \* \*. In a single year, 1932, 4,000,000 peasants died of starvation in the Ukraine and North Caucasus, the most fertile part of all Russia.

Then he says:

Prof. L. Tarashevich, noted Russian sociologist, in an official report to the League of Nations, says that 30,000,000 Russians have starved to death since the country turned communistic. This astounding figure is substantiated by Fridth of Nansen, head of the world organization of the Red Cross and delegate of the League of Nations to Russia.

## BOARD OF EDUCATION WHITEWASHED COMMUNISM IN 1928

The Washington Post, April 3, 1928, under main headline, "Reds Renew Drive as School Board Launches Inquiry", and subheadline, "Boy of 12 Testifies of Effort to Bring Him Into Fold of Communism", said:

Communitic elements, whose activities in the schools was the subject of inquiry by the Board of Education yesterday, responded to the Board's thrust by renewal of proselytizing campaigns in the schools.

One 12-year-old youngster, who testified before the hearing yesterday, told the Board that yesterday he had been approached in the Central High School by another youth who sought to enlist his interest in communism.

Talk of communism pervaded the whole meeting. There are in the District schools, according to the testimony, two organizations affiliated with the Communist Party. One is the Young Communist League and the other the Young Pioneers. Columbia High School, MacFarland High School, Central High School, and Business High School were mentioned by the witnesses as having been points of communist activity.

Mr. Henry Gilligan's statement that the Appropriations Committee has not the right "to tell us how to run our schools" was applauded.

Mr. Chairman, that was back in April 1928, before I became a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and when the Washington Post then could give us the news on communistic activity, because that was before Eugene Meyer paid \$825,000 for it at "his" public auction and became its owner, a plant which once he had offered \$5,000,000 for, and which thereafter David Lawrence signed a contract to buy it and pay \$3,000,000 for it.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that Congress must take immediate steps to clean up this communism in the Washington schools and defeat the Sisson bill, which would allow it to remain and flourish, and stands its ground in denying the \$78,660 asked by Dr. Ballou for his communistic so-called character education, which he is now urging the Senate to place in the District appropriation bill.

## WILLING TO GIVE THE DEVIL HIS DUES

Mr. Chairman, I have been libeled many times by the newspapers of William Randolph Hearst. They have been uniformly unjust and unfair to me. They have refused to report me correctly. They have viciously slandered me. They have persecuted me. Nevertheless, I am willing to be just to them. While I despise the public and private life of Hearst and the unjust way he has cruelly libeled many good men in public office, I am willing to give the devil his dues.

## HEARST'S FIGHTS AGAINST ALIENS AND COMMUNISTS HIGHLY COMMENDABLE

William Randolph Hearst and his newspapers deserve the thanks of the Nation for the creditable, determined fight they are making against communism and to rid our country of aliens and to preserve American jobs for Americans. No other metropolitan newspapers in the United States are making such a fight. Where is there another metropolitan newspaper that has been willing to make the sacrifice? Hearst and his papers have made the sacrifice. They have been willing to pay the price. They have been willing to suffer all incidental losses. And I know the sacrifice is great, and the losses are heavy. Hearst has every radical in the United States sniping at him and his papers. Hearst



has every Communist in the United States doing their dead level best to injure him and his business. He has the George S. Countses and the Charles A. Beardes and every Russian Soviet sympathizer in the United States barking and snapping at him. It requires a great deal of intestinal fortitude for him and his papers to continue the fights under such handicaps. And, for one, I am willing to offset some of his many almost unpardonable sins, with the good he is accomplishing in his uncompromising fight for Americanism. Although being one whom he has maliciously slandered, I am forced to admit that the ledger being kept on him by St. Peter has two sides to it; and while there is a tremendous lot of bad on the bad side, there is some good on the good side, and I will leave it to St. Peter finally to decide just how far his ledger pages on Hearst are unbalanced.

Mr. Chairman, this speech will contain facts that ought to be of interest to every colleague in Congress. I hope my friend from California, with whom I have differed slightly on some questions, will read what I have to say.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; surely.

Mr. SCOTT. I hope the gentleman will keep in mind what happened to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] when he asked Mr. Hearst to be on his side.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not asking Hearst to be on my side. I have whipped Hearst in every election that has ever come off in my district. I am just "giving the devil his dues."

DANIEL WEBSTER

Mr. Chairman, I am not an orator. I will, however, conclude my speech by quoting from one of our greatest orators, Daniel Webster, in his address on the "One Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington", when Daniel Webster said:

Other misfortunes may be borne, or their efforts overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle, even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitter tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw—the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a short article from a newspaper, about two sticks in length.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, at this hour everybody feels like being relieved and going into the open instead of having reference made to a penitentiary.

In the short time I have I wish to call attention to a matter that has relationship to my old home town, Lewisburg, Pa.

About 7 years ago there was a bill introduced which included an authorization and an appropriation for a penitentiary in my home town, an unusual community, rare in the fact of the quality of the intellectual standard, due to the presence in the town of a university, which has been there for a hundred years. Most of our people went through this Bucknell University, and those who did not came in contact with those who had, and the refining process has been going on all that time.

We hoped it might continue to be on the same kind of intellectual plane, with the same high culture and the same atmosphere; but there came along a desire on the part of

Mr. Bates, who had charge of the Federal prisons of the country, to locate a penitentiary on land adjacent to the town.

Personally, I was in hearty accord with the methods he has adopted in regard to the care of prisoners and the hope of the reclamation of these unfortunate men, but I did object to having a penitentiary planted within 1 mile of that classic town.

I pursued the matter through the Pennsylvania Legislature, where it was required to have a special grant to make it a Federal territory. There were 1,500 acres withdrawn from taxation and the penitentiary placed in that township that was named for an illustrious hero of the Revolutionary War, Maj. John Kelly, instead of a monument being put there to the glory of this man who covered the rear guard of George Washington in his retreat across New Jersey in January 1777. Covering the rear guard over Stony Brook, at Worths Mills, he was supposed to have been lost, and the remainder of the guard followed Washington into Trenton; but John Kelly made a recovery and emerged from the icy stream. Instead of being lost, he reported at Washington's headquarters the next morning and brought in two Hessian prisoners.

And so this township where this penitentiary is located was named in honor of Maj. John Kelly.

There is no objection to the penitentiary itself. Whatever I found that is adverse to the theory, from the research I have made as to the reclamation of men who have been in the penitentiary, I still believe that support should be given to Mr. Bates for what he has in contemplation.

But I find in this appropriation bill a recommendation that new housing facilities for guards be built on Government property adjoining this penitentiary at Lewisburg—and this without any notice to or conference with the businessmen of Lewisburg, who worked most diligently to secure options from the farmers who owned this wonderful thousand acres, with an additional 500 acres, so that the penitentiary might occupy 1,500 acres free of taxation in a county of less than 17,000 population. The Government through Mr. Bates accepted over \$20,000 from those businessmen to buy the options and then the land. There may not have been more than an implication that the location of that institution near this town would in some way benefit the businessmen and be of some use to them. Nevertheless, I hope my friends here and the members of the committee, whom I have found to be most courteous and gracious, ultimately will not permit Mr. Bates to walk out on those businessmen whose money he accepted to buy this land, to take it away from this great township and dedicate it to this prison instead of allowing it to be kept in memory of Maj. John Kelly. It was proposed by Mr. Bates that he be given something over \$1,000,000 with which to build housing for employees of various penitentiaries of the country. There can be no objection, of course, to the appropriation of ample money to house the top men from the warden on to these great scientists who must be there or constantly near this particular kind of a penitentiary.

The men there are to be taught new ideas of life, they are to be given everything up to a college education, so that they may emerge with the freedom of the plantation and walk out into the world reclaimed. We all agree that the warden is a most excellent citizen, a World War veteran, Major Hill. He was formerly warden of the penitentiary at Joliet, Ill. Dr. Wilson is a noted scientist, and there are several others of his class—Walter Hunter, Thomas C. Farmer, Mortimer Davenport, and C. G. Murphy. They should be close to the prison for obvious reasons; but when they propose to build on that place enough houses to accommodate the entire corps of employees of that institution and on untaxable ground, to remove them away from the town of Lewisburg and depopulate it to that extent, I doubt very much whether these gentlemen, these keepers, would care to have that done. Many of them are from the South. They are a fine type of men. I know most of them. They have come to my office and they have come to my house. They are Federal employees and I am a Federal officer. I do not believe they would care to be put away out there in the country, and I am certain that there are at least some members of



the Committee on Appropriations who do not believe in that idea, and I surmise that instead of giving Mr. Bates \$1,000,000 that he asked, they cut it to \$300,000 for that very reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. FOCHT. I desire this minute to say that I think those men to whom I have referred, these excellent gentlemen, guards and others, who have all passed civil-service examinations, would much prefer to have an adequate salary to live on than to have these houses planted out on the penitentiary grounds, and I hope Mr. Bates will be governed accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. FOCHT. The newspaper article referred to by me is as follows:

#### SUNBURY ITEM, APRIL 1

Word has been received that the House Appropriations Committee has recommended to Congress that proposed new housing facilities for guards at the northeastern penitentiary, Lewisburg, be built on Government property adjoining the prison.

The committee further recommended that \$300,000 be made available for the construction of the homes on the reservation. In making this recommendation, the committee said it did so because of the desirability for purposes of safety to have the yard force housed on Government property adjoining the prison.

This action was taken after a group of Lewisburg businessmen had asked the committee to have the homes built in Lewisburg, and comes at a time when Lewisburg has started a construction program to furnish adequate housing for the guards.

It is a slap at Lewisburg business interests who raised a large sum of money to purchase the ground on which the institution is built, as the construction of the homes on the reservation will make them untaxable and will remove a source of revenue.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

#### COMPARISON OF AGRICULTURAL PLANS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, October 31, 1932, Mr. Arthur M. Hyde, Secretary of Agriculture under President Hoover, in making his report to the President on the agricultural situation, submitted a land-use planning and conservation program which can be summarized in the following language:

This program envisages: (1) A better economic utilization of our land resources, (2) control of erosion, (3) a far-sighted provision for future timber and public recreation needs, (4) preservation of wildlife, (5) the gradual diversion to other purposes of lands submarginal for farming, (6) guidance of proper enterprises in land settlement, and (7) important adjustments in governmental organization in the distribution of local institutions and in local taxation and expenditures—adjustments that have become or will become necessary as important changes in land use are made.

January 17, 1936, Mr. Hoover, addressing the Nation from Lincoln, Nebr., said, among other things:

The second group of policies is: To retire submarginal lands where people cannot make a living. Do it in the more effective and humane way proposed by Secretary Hyde in 1932. Retard new reclamation projects until the land can be used.

President Roosevelt, in a statement released March 1, 1936, hailed the Soil Conservation Act—substitute for the A. A. A.—as a measure which “seeks to salvage and conserve the greatest values in human life and resources”, and, among other things, said:

The new law has three major objectives which are inseparably, and of necessity, linked with the national welfare. The first of these aims is conservation of the soil itself through wise and proper land use. The second is the reestablishment and maintenance of farm income at fair levels, so that the great gains made by agriculture in the past 3 years can be preserved and national recovery can continue. The third major objective is the protection of consumers by assuring adequate supplies of food and fiber now and in the future.

Saturday, March 21, 1936, Secretary Wallace released his press statement to the morning papers setting forth the national soil-conservation plan embraced in the recently enacted Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. Since that release was received by the people of the Nation through the agency of the press numerous meetings have been held throughout the entire land under the direction of

representatives of the Secretary and the Department of Agriculture.

Tragedy stalks the land. The self-denial living of the farm people in their struggle to eke out an existence on a basis which will enable them to pay the high interest rates and taxes necessary to hold title to their homes; the foreclosure proceedings and loss of homes on the part of thousands of farm folk; the lack of purchasing power due to a combination of many factors such as importation of foodstuffs from other lands under reciprocal trade treaties, lack of organization among farmers in the selling of their products, increasing loss of foreign markets due largely to staggering overhead expense saddled on the backs of American farmers, thus placing them in a noncompetitive position with farmers of other lands, and the extravagant use of public funds which directly result in the necessity of increased taxes to replenish those funds for extravagant use. This is the tragedy.

The great contest is now on between individual farmers and groups and sections to see who shall receive the division of the fund that has been made available for the purpose of leasing, renting, or retiring certain acreage from direct production. No one knows what the effect will be. Who can answer as to how many thousand acres will be kept from cultivation, how many will be shifted from soil depleters to soil builders, or what the effect of it all will be on farm prices. Already there is great controversy arising because of a difference in opinion between soil experts, agronomists, and others as to really what constitutes crops which deplete the soil and which build up the soil. The rates of soil-conserving payments vary to such a great extent as between certain specified crops, and the maximum acreage with respect to which payments will be made is so dissimilar that great dissatisfaction will necessarily arise among the farmers. That dissatisfaction is now very evident and groups already have their representatives in Washington demanding that the rates be changed and benefits shifted to a different basis than that announced by the Secretary on March 21.

Apparently all students and authorities agree on the fact that the United States faces a dangerous enemy in the forces of soil erosion and fertility wastage. So recently the press of the Nation has carried headlines setting forth vast and staggering destruction by reason of the ravages of floods. Stifling dust storms continue their havoc in the West and Southwest—all of which emphasizes what is happening to America's food basket of the present and of the future. Heretofore our supply of foodstuffs has been so plentiful and so much fertile land has been available that it is most difficult for us to visualize the millions of acres going the way of the semideserts of other countries. When Secretary Hyde made his report to President Hoover in 1932 he had in mind what discussion and trial and error have so clearly brought out during the past 4 years. Secretary Hyde also had in mind that the semideserts of northern Africa and the now waste and eroded lands of China were once fertile fields which gave food to the teeming millions of human beings of those lands. Nature's balance between, on the one hand, the beneficial influence of verdure of grass and tree that hold moisture, and, on the other hand, the destructive influence of water run-off and dust-carrying winds was broken, and those countries had to pay the price of lost soil. Today America is awakening to the same destructive influences at work in this great land, and Secretary Hyde pointed it out to us in 1932 before his retirement from the position as Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, there appears to be a unanimity of opinion that these forces must be halted. But how? That is the question. It now appears that we have gone down the road far enough to realize that neither the individual nor the State can cope with the whole problem. If the solution of the problem lies beyond any authority so far vested in the Federal Government, we should lose no time in ascertaining that fact. This becomes a most serious question for the consideration of the two major parties of this country, because we are now on the eve of the national conventions, at



which time the political platforms, which will certainly carry agricultural planks, must be drawn for presentment to the farmers of this country.

It is very interesting to take the March 21 release of the Secretary of Agriculture and the March 1 release of the President and compare them with the following brief analysis of Senators Vandenberg and Dickinson and Messrs. Hoover and Landon:

#### SENATOR VANDENBERG'S PLAN

First. Provide complete tariff protection for crops sold for domestic consumption by American farmers.

Second. Offer Government leadership in storing and ultimately marketing surplus crops at the price they would bring on world markets. This means that just as industry with an export surplus sells at home at the domestic price and sells abroad at the world price, so if the farmer can be completely protected in a domestic price at home and a world price for his exportable surplus he can approach effective parity of opportunity.

#### SENATOR DICKINSON'S PLAN

First. Prevent contradictions in Government policy. Eliminate them. On the one hand, they seek to limit crop production, while, on the other, they undermine still further the position of agriculture. The subsidizing of activity arising from the opening up of vast new tracts in the public domain which under present conditions are neither needed nor economic in character must be ended, not encouraged.

Second. The removal of all attempt at artificial bureaucratic regulation relating to crop limitations and a return to the policy of Federal assistance in the development of cooperative production and marketing organizations. Strengthen self-government among the farmers and let this be in a constitutional way and at all times conforming with the evolution of our American institutions.

Third. Fulfillment of present outstanding A. A. A. contracts by the Federal Government.

Fourth. Stabilize present agricultural production through Federal policies aimed at (a) retirement of marginal lands from production and cultivation and the substitution of an intelligent land-use program, and (b) stimulation of crop diversification which will bring about better balanced production. Grow furs as an illustration and stop annual importation of \$150,000,000 worth of these. Let this be the move to stop underconsumption and undernourishment rampant in the United States today.

Fifth. Establish a broad program to restore farm export markets. Apply principle of utilizing national purchasing power abroad. Stimulate the exchange of goods along lines successfully used by Great Britain in her Ottawa trade agreements; this way our international trade can be rebuilt. Meet world price differentials by allocating a proportion of the customs revenues. Equalize world and domestic prices at the custom's barrier, not, as under the processing-tax system, where equalization comes directly out of the pockets of the American consumer.

Sixth. Stabilize the currency and fix the tariff policy, definite in rates and protective of the American standard of living. Cancel reciprocity agreements such as the Canadian and Cuban trade treaties which lower tariff barriers on farm imports. Discontinue program of scarcity while at the same time encouraging imports of foreign-produced livestock, grains, and other farm commodities.

#### EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER'S PLAN

He suggests a group of "aids" among which we find the following listed:

First. Increase consumption of food by restoration of employment. This can come only with a balanced Budget, stable currency, and credit.

Give the farmer our own home market. Adopt such sane national policies as will again restore reasonable export markets. Out of this group of aids we can restore demand to many millions of fertile acres.

Second. Retire submarginal lands where people cannot make a living. Do it in the more effective and humane way proposed by Secretary Hyde in 1932. Retard new reclamation projects until the land can be used.

Third. Encourage cooperative marketing and those marketing agreements which contribute to preventing "gluts" in the "flow" to markets. The farm-credit machinery established by Republican administration and by the New Deal should be still further improved.

Fourth. Beyond these measures this farm situation is now one where still further emergency measures pending general economic recovery are necessary—doubly necessary as a new road must be built whereby agriculture can get back on solid ground from the quicksand of the New Deal.

Fifth. One new method is that instead of trying to find a balance to agriculture by paying the farmer to curtail a crop, we should endeavor to expand another crop which can be marketed or which would improve the fertility of the soil. We import vast quantities of vegetable oils, sugar, and other commodities. There are industrial products that could be introduced by the American farmer. We need to replenish our soils with legumes and restore coverages.

Reverse economy of scarcity to that of an economy of plenty.

The farmer must be entirely free to use his own skill and judgment. Program to be handled by land-grant colleges be free of politics and the vast bureaucracy now loaded upon the farmer. Coordinated by a nonpolitical national board. Cost to be borne by general taxpayer and not loaded on backs of poor through some tax like the processing tax.

#### LANDON AGRICULTURAL PLAN

First. See H. R. 10757, introduced January 30, 1936, by Mr. HOPE.

Second. Bill suggests a new basis and new plan to give tariff equality to producers of surplus agricultural products such as wheat, hogs, cotton, and tobacco. Instead of attempting to make tariff on surplus crops actively effective, plan is frankly based on idea that as far as its effects on prices are concerned the producer of surplus commodities has no tariff protection. His disadvantage consists in the fact the price he pays for the things which he buys is enhanced by the protective tariff on other commodities.

Third. Simple matter to ascertain approximately what proportion of the cost price of the commodities which the farmer buys is due to the tariff. Plan provides the producer of surplus commodities should be given a tariff-equivalent payment on that part of his production consumed domestically, which is equivalent to the tariff costs which he bears. Use the tariff itself to correct the disadvantages created by it.

Fourth. Secretary of Agriculture to use the 200 articles used by Department of Agriculture in compiling its indexes on farm purchasing power. Tariff Commission is to ascertain the approximate amount which the tariff adds to the price of those articles the farmer most commonly buys.

Fifth. If it were found that on an average the tariff adds 25 percent to the cost of the articles which the farmer buys, a tariff-equivalent payment would be given to the producer of export commodities amounting to 25 percent of that portion of his sales which went into domestic consumption.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I view this subject in the light of what we have lived through the past 15 years, and further with the above thoughts and plans before us, the agricultural problem from (a) to (z) can be briefly summarized, as follows:

- (a) Is the Soil Erosion Act a satisfactory proposal?
- (b) Shall the movement of people be back to the farm or back to the city?
- (c) Cooperatives: Shall they be strengthened, encouraged, and perfected?
- (d) Cost-of-production guaranty: What shall we do about that?
- (e) Crop loans: How shall they be financed; at what rate of interest, and so forth?
- (f) Debt: What shall we do with the great farm debt?
- (g) Domestic-allotment plan and export debentures: What shall we do?
- (h) Embargo on farm imports: Shall we stop them for good or temporarily?
- (i) Export bounty for agriculture: Shall we adopt that as a policy?



(j) Foreign markets: How shall they be recovered and maintained?

(k) Frazier-Lemke farm mortgage refinance bill: What shall be its destiny?

(l) Irrigation and reclamation: Shall present policy be continued?

(m) McNary-Haugen plan: Can it be made to solve the problem of marketing?

(n) Marginal lands: Shall they be purchased, leased, rented, retired, or what?

(o) Packing and processing industry: Can the farmer ever receive fair prices operating as heretofore and selling as a disorganized unit?

(p) Price fixing: Relationship of farm and industrial commodities. What?

(q) Processing taxes: Shall they be reinstated or forever abandoned?

(r) Production control: Shall it be exercised as a permanent policy?

(s) Reciprocal-trade treaties: Shall they be abandoned or continued?

(t) Rural resettlement: Shall this become a national policy? If so, to what extent and on what basis?

(u) Soil improvement: Shall we make it a national policy? Shall the State or Federal power be in control of the program? Can the Federal power be exercised?

(v) Surpluses: Shall we prevent their accumulation, destroy them, pool them, warehouse them on farm or in centralized State or Federal warehouses, dump them abroad, establish the ever-normal granary, or what shall we do with them if once produced? What method of financing and at what rate of interest to the farmer?

(w) Tariff for farmer: Has he had the benefit of tariffs? Has he been hurt by the tariff with relation to free imports, surplus crops, and nonsurplus crops? Have the benefits provided by law been passed on to or extended down to the farmer?

(x) Taxation for benefit of farmer: Shall we attempt this as class legislation? Does the farmer want us to do so? Is it permissible for the Federal Government to so act under Constitution as now drawn? If adopted, will a constitutional amendment be necessary?

(y) Unless legislation is enacted will agriculture grow worse or work itself into a better position unaided?

(z) Shall the field be left to the survival of the fittest and thus let competition solve the problem? Can the situation be remedied by legislative action?

These questions are before the Nation today. They are of great importance to the agricultural worker and investor, and certainly they are of great interest to the industrial worker, who is almost entirely dependent upon the purchasing power of the American farmer and those he supports. The issue is now before us.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the people of the South have been very much disturbed recently by the passage of discriminatory legislation in Wisconsin, and the consideration of such legislation in certain other States, notably the State of New Jersey, where it is proposed to bar or impose prohibitive restrictions upon the use or sale of oleomargarine, in the supposed purpose of bringing about benefits to the dairy industry. Cottonseed oil is one of the most important constituents of oleomargarine, and the cotton growers of the South are naturally very much concerned by the enactment of any legislation which proposes to place a handicap upon the marketing of their products. The result has been to bring about in the South an organization of consumers, known as the Southwide Association of Consumers. One of its purposes is to bring about the removal of this discriminatory legislation and the defeat of similar pending legislation and the banding together of consumers against the purchasing and consumption of products from States which have enacted legislation of the discriminatory character to which I have referred. That is indeed a very unfortunate situation. Everything possible should be done to facilitate the exchange

of products between the agricultural sections of the country, and the passage of legislation by States attempting to prevent the purchase and consumption by their citizens of legitimate and healthful food products is undemocratic, un-American, and, in my opinion, unconstitutional.

Anything which is calculated to bring about a controversy of this sort cannot fail to be harmful to all sections of the country which may engage in that controversy. It is not my purpose to pour fuel on the flames of the controversy, but I have here a letter written by Hon. J. D. Beck, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Wisconsin, and a reply to that letter written by Mrs. R. L. Truman, of Atlanta, Ga., who is president of the Southwide Association of Consumers. These letters present, I think, fully the respective contentions of these two parties, and constitute information which the House should have. I do not wish to enter into any detailed discussion of the subject matter at this time, and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD in connection with my remarks the two letters to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND MARKETS,  
Madison, Wis., February 24, 1936.

Mrs. R. L. TRUMAN,  
1007-1008 Norris Building, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MADAM: I recently received a copy of your address before the Hamilton Club, in Chicago, in what I believe can be termed a defense of oleomargarine as a substitute for butter, though you seem to deny that.

I wonder if you are familiar with the recent investigation made by the University of Nebraska as to the food value of oleomargarine. This experiment showed that 69 rats were fed on butter for a period of 8 weeks and that at the end of the experiment they were all alive and they gained in weight from 46 to 90 grams. One hundred eighty-one rats were fed oleomargarine. At the end of the 8 weeks' period, all of them had died but 36. Twenty-seven of these showed a loss in weight, while 9 showed an average gain of 25 grams. The Wisconsin College of Agriculture obtained similar results from feeding rats filled milk—milk from which the butterfat had been extracted and vegetable oils inserted.

The charge has been made by dietitians that oleomargarine is almost wholly lacking in vitamin A, a necessary element for growth and development. Some oleomargarine companies have therefore been trying to inject vitamin A into oleomargarine. Thirty of the rats fed oleomargarine were fed that in which vitamin A was supposed to have been added. Twenty-eight of these died before 8 weeks had expired. Two still lived but showed a loss in weight. These rats were not fed as sparingly of oleomargarine as those who were fed butter.

I also wonder if you are aware of the fact that this controversy over oleomargarine and butter only involves about 4.3 percent of the cottonseed oil produced in the country. I also wonder if you are aware of the fact that in the 10 leading cotton States of the Union the farmers of those States receive an income from dairying in excess of \$4 for every \$1 they obtain in income from cottonseed oil, and that you are thereby putting up a fight against one of the greatest industries of the South in behalf of 4.3 percent of a product of secondary importance. I also wonder if you are aware of the further fact that the southern growers are getting but very little remuneration out of the production of cottonseed oil, but the remuneration is going to the manufacturers of oleomargarine, who are spending millions of dollars to carry on a false campaign throughout both the North and South in the interests of oleomargarine. I am wondering if these interests are not the ones back of your organization, known as the Southwide Association of Consumers.

I am wondering, also, whether you are aware of the fact that at one time 26 percent of the ingredients that went into oleomargarine were cottonseed oil and that the oleomargarine interests themselves have done more to cut out the production of oleomargarine from cottonseed oil than all the States put together; in fact, they have done exactly what they and such organizations as you represent are now accusing States of doing who want to put out a healthful product to replace a product that is destructive of health.

Very truly yours,

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND MARKETS,  
J. D. BECK, Commissioner.

SOUTHWIDE ASSOCIATION OF CONSUMERS,  
Atlanta, Ga., March 25, 1936.

Hon. J. D. BECK,  
Commissioner, Department of Agriculture and Markets,  
State of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

DEAR MR. BECK: Your letter has not been replied to more promptly because both Miss Gleaton and I have been out in the field organizing consumer groups in the Southern States.



In order that your letter and my reply may have as wide publicity as possible, I shall send a copy of your letter and mine to each of the Governors and commissioners of agriculture in the cotton-growing States, to the leading southern newspapers, southern Congressmen, to Governor La Follette, and to the dean of the College of Agriculture of Wisconsin in order that they may see the type of letter being sent out by the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Wisconsin.

You imply I am not sincere in saying that I am not advocating margarine as a substitute for butter. I am advocating margarine as a supplement to or an alternative for butter. I am anxious to see margarine sold in an open free market as butter is—on its merits, for what it is, a wholesome, nutritious, low-cost, and much-needed table spread.

I do not understand the logic nor the economics of the argument of the butter interests that if margarine is outlawed and the infant industry completely destroyed butter would then be sold at a higher price and that poor people would by some sort of legerdemain be provided with an increased income with which to buy higher-priced butter. You apparently leave out of the picture the vast numbers of people below the poverty level who can't buy butter at the present price, much less at a higher price. Have you any solution of the problem as to how really poor people may secure the needed table fat to eat on their bread? Dry bread is rather chokey!

Your account of the experiment with feeding margarine to rats at the University of Nebraska made me write for that report, which I find very different from the portion of it which you quote. As against your false interpretation of the experiment I would call your attention to the research in your own university and to similar clinical research in numerous other universities in this country and abroad, which shows that vegetable oils are as wholesome and nutritious and as easily digested as animal fats.

Frankly I am not at all interested in preserving the life of rats, though you may have brought a wonderful discovery to light—the fact that margarine kills rats by the wholesale! Perhaps the margarine manufacturers should know about it, since they might find it more profitable to sell margarine as a substitute for Rough-on-Rats than as a "substitute" for butter! The United States Department of Agriculture reports that American farmers lose more than \$200,000,000 a year by rats. Think what it would mean to the farmers if they were to place large quantities of margarine in their barns and other places where the rats work such havoc!

But, seriously, I am interested in helping the consumers of limited income, the farmer who needs more income from his crops and additional sources of income, and a more adequate diet for everybody, especially those with very limited income, who now have neither butter nor margarine.

Surely you must know that margarine is accepted by the medical authorities as equally as nourishing, as wholesome, as easily digested as butter. If it were "destructive of health", as you indicate, the Pure Food and Drugs Administration of the Department of Agriculture should put it off the market. Certainly if it is not a wholesome food, there would have been some cases against it during the past year, when notices of judgment were issued by the United States Food and Drugs Administration and 3,821 separate shipments of food were prosecuted in the Federal courts of the United States as violations of the Pure Food and Drugs Act. Of this number, not one was against margarine; while 2,558, or 67 percent, involved shipments of cream and butter (see copy of article reprinted from the March issue of Veterinary Medicine, which describes these Federal cases against butter and cream, under the caption "Filthy, putrid, moldy, rancid, and decomposed", enclosed). So, you see, it is not margarine, as your letter would indicate, that is offending our pure-food laws.

Medical authorities, dietitians, and chemists tell us that margarine is just as easily digested as butter. Margarine is made of vegetable or animal fats, milk, and salt—foods consumed daily by millions of people. If they, in combination as margarine, have ever destroyed the health of any individual, I've never heard of it.

Of course, you know, as I do, that the vitamin-A content of butter is variable; that vitamin A is largely present only when the cows are grazing on green grass, which is scarcely 6 months of the year in your part of the country. The rest of the time the butter manufacturers put in yellow coloring, which, I am informed, is not vitamin A. How are consumers to know when butter contains vitamin A and when coloring matter is added to give the desired yellow tint to butter?

Yes; I know that vegetable-oil margarine has very little vitamin A, but that is no reason to discount it. I have before me a list of sources of vitamin A prepared by Dr. E. V. McCollum, the discoverer of vitamins. They are, in addition to butter, the following foods found in abundance in the South and most parts of the country: Green cabbage, green asparagus, carrots, chard, collards, dandelion greens, kale, green lettuce, pumpkins, spinach, turnip tops, Hubbard squash, sweetpotatoes, bananas, cantalopes, cherries, tomatoes, and eggs.

Summed up, we are not dependent upon either butter or margarine for our vitamin A.

You have asked me if I knew certain things. May I ask you if you know that you have reversed your figures in the amount of revenue which southern farmers receive from cottonseed and from their dairying interests? The figures of the Department of Agriculture are more nearly the reverse. Southern farmers get more than four times as much from their cottonseed as they get from their butterfat sales.

I would be glad to see southern farmers receive greater income from both cottonseed (which has come to be 20 percent of the

value of the cotton crop) and dairying, which is a growing industry in this section of the country. If the restrictions were taken from margarine, we would have need for about 35,000 more milk cows to produce the milk in which the margarine would have to be churned. So, you see, dairying in the South has nothing to fear from the free manufacture of margarine. It has only to fear the northern butter interests, who would put our southern dairymen out of business if they could, just as they are trying to destroy the margarine interests.

Answering one of your statements, certainly the margarine people have spent millions to develop and defend their industry. What business of national scope has not? We will also admit the margarine people have contributed to our campaign. We are grateful for their help, and likewise for that of the cottonseed crushers and refiners, the southern press, and other southern groups and individuals who are supporting this worthy cause. But I would like to remind you, Mr. Beck, of your gross unfairness in referring to this effort on the part of the women of the South as a "false campaign."

Would you contend that it is perfectly proper for the butter manufacturers to finance a lobby, a racket of the character of the Washington one, whose avowed purpose is to destroy markets for farmers who happen to produce low-cost vegetable oils instead of high-cost butterfat; whose achievements, be it said to the everlasting shame of Congress, deprive possibly 40,000,000 American consumers of the only table fat that is within their meager reach? Would you contend that such financial support is holy and just and in regular order, and at the same time condemn our consumers' group for requesting the support of the processors of our southern vegetable oils, in a cause which unselfishly seeks a higher standard of living for the helpless consumer of this country?

So far as funds are concerned, if you will secure and publish in detail the sources of the campaign funds of the National Association of Butter Manufacturers, the National Dairy Union, the National Dairy Council, and the Holman organization, we will be proud to make public in like manner the names of all our members and supporters!

You should know that only within the last 3 years was it discovered that superior margarine can be made from cottonseed and other domestic oils. Previous to this discovery little cottonseed or other vegetable oil was used in the manufacture of margarine. Now manufacturers are using these rich southern oils more and more. What was done prior to the time of their adoption has very little bearing on the situation as it exists today, or as it will be in the years ahead.

I would warn you against the use of libelous language implying that margarine is "destructive of health." As I said before, if it is destructive of health, the Federal Pure Food and Drugs Administration should compel its withdrawal from the food markets of the country. If it is a wholesome food, your unfair attack on it should be reported to the Federal Trade Commission, so that a cease-and-desist order may be issued against you and other selfish interests for "unfair methods of competition." It would not be the first time that the butter interests have had a government order issued against them for using untrue and unfair methods against margarine.

In the final analysis, the South has always been, and we hope will continue to be, a large consumer of your fine Wisconsin products. Rather than the unfriendly attitude you and your legislature have recently demonstrated against us, would it not be more constructive, and in the long run more to the advantage of Wisconsin producers, if you would completely reverse your position and seek a greater exchange of commodities between these two great agricultural sections?

Yours very truly,

MAUD POLLARD TRUMAN, *President.*  
(Mrs. R. L. Truman.)

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that months ago this country, through the Department of State, made a gentlemen's agreement with Japan that Japan should not export so much cotton cloth to this country. I want to read some staggering figures showing how Japan is just laughing at us and is not keeping that agreement:

Imports of bleached cotton cloth from Japan for the year 1935 were 5 times greater than in 1934, 117 times greater than in 1933, and 584 times the imports for 1932.

Imports of printed cotton cloth from Japan for the year 1935 were 5 times greater than 1934, 7 times greater than in 1933, and 8½ times the imports for 1932.

The increase in importations of cotton handkerchiefs from Japan show they imported 3½ times as many in 1935 as in 1934, 44 times as many as in 1933, and 404 times as many as in 1932.

Imports of cotton velveteens from Japan for 1935 were 21 times greater than in 1934, the only 2 years we have for a basis of comparison, as little or none was imported prior to



1934. Against the startling increase of competition at low prices, the American mills can survive only if they have adequate reserves to wait until the State Department forces Japan to keep its gentlemen's agreement, and as if the great competition were not enough, we are about to be asked by this administration to tax industry so it cannot accumulate reserves in the future. Employers and employees of every foreign nation have looked upon this country with envy and admiration. They know that the workers in the United States have been paid higher wages than labor in any other nation in the world. Today they look upon us with amazement. They think we are allowing countries such as Japan to take our trade from us, and they know that eventually it will mean that our workers will be paid less in order to compete with poorly paid foreign labor. If we continue, we shall be the laughingstock of the entire world. Clever foreign countries will gladly take advantage of us. We must halt before it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAIN].

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, last evening it was my privilege and pleasure to listen to a radio program sponsored by the National Education Association, bringing to our attention a matter which is before Congress and before the country. A bid has been made this afternoon by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] for the support of the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. JENCKES]. As far as I am concerned, I choose to enlist under the banner of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. O'DAY] who contributed such an interesting part to the program over the radio broadcast of the National Broadcasting Co. last evening.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a teacher in the public schools and a member of a Board of Education. I have four children in the public schools in the District of Columbia. I am somewhat disturbed over the current report that the Sisson bill is not to come upon the floor of this House until April 27. I wish the matter might be expedited and disposed of at an earlier date.

It requires courage of a high order to admit making a mistake. Apologies of any real significance are unnatural and usually attended with difficulties. The mother of little Johnny finally convinced him that he ought to apologize for making a remark reflecting upon the intelligence of his aunt, so he met the situation by going to the offended relative and saying: "Auntie, I am very sorry that you are so stupid."

With all due regard to our tumultuous tempestuous Texan of the Seventeenth District of the Lone Star State, I think this Congress made a mistake when the "little red rider" was piloted through the legislative forest of 1935 with its basketful of complications.

When we repealed the Potato Control Act we said it is all right again to raise potatoes in the rural districts of America. When, and if, we repeal the "red rider" clause some people may think we are saying it is all right now to raise hell in the school districts of our land.

It does not sound very well to say that Congress has repealed the law providing "That hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the payment of the salary of any person teaching or advocating communism."

That piece of information separated from the context will not make sense. It is hard to explain. It is an unnatural position for the American patriot to take. It would have been so much better if the original rider had not been inserted. It does not relieve the situation very much to say to the gentleman from Texas, "I am sorry that you were so stupid."

I have said that it takes courage—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAIN. I am sorry I cannot yield. The time is too short.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman, under the usage and custom here, should

not refer to anyone in the way he has done unless he is willing to yield.

Mr. MAIN. If the gentleman would like to have me, I will strike from the RECORD any suggestion of stupidity on the part of the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I was just calling the gentleman's attention to the custom.

Mr. MAIN. I thank the gentleman.

I have stated that it takes courage to admit making a mistake. Perhaps I have a measure of that characteristic, perhaps I am only rash and indiscreet. But by way of preface, may I say that I was voluntarily inducted into the military service at a time when I was in a deferred classification. I was a practicing attorney with a wife and child. I asked for admission to service with the field artillery. I wanted to serve my country, and I am willing now, or at any later time, to enter active military service to defend my country against invaders from without, or from the attacks of traitors within the boundaries of our Nation. I am an ex-service man, a member of the American Legion, and I stand ready to don the uniform again if my country calls. Of course, I believe that Christian civilization should have the genius and character to meet such issues without resort to armed force. And I cannot share the apprehension or fear the results anticipated by the alarmists in connection with the alleged spread of communism in our country. We will not tolerate the introduction of subversive doctrines in our schools. But we should not interfere with factual presentation of current events. One of the thoughtful, progressive teachers in my district asks the following question:

How can I teach my boys and girls what democracy is if I cannot draw the contrasting pictures of what life under communism and fascism is like?

An American by the name of Sidney Franklin, who has received considerable notoriety as a bullfighter in Spain, is reported to have said in a recent interview that it is not the color of the matador's cape that enrages the bull but the fact that the cape is in motion. Mr. Franklin is further quoted as saying that the bull has no discrimination as to color. But, whether the bull sees red or not, whenever he sees a foreign object in motion he charges pell-mell, snorting and bellowing, usually to his own destruction.

Be that as it may, it will take a long time to convince the average American that it is safe to wear a red shirt while standing in an open field where a healthy bull is enclosed. So also will it take a long time for the patriotic citizen in this country to overcome the natural suspicion of anything that is "red" politically.

However, there is a most remarkable development taking place in Russia today. It will avail us nothing to refuse to look at this development. It is commonly referred to as a "red" movement, and is therefore offensive to the average American. But it is motion in the Government of Russia, and it seems to be an act of nearsighted color-blindness to refuse to take account of that motion.

I am one of those who thinks the motion is in a backward direction and not forward. I cannot believe that any good will come to any nation that falls into the clutches of propaganda aimed at the destruction of the church, or which smears scandal and blasphemy over the sacred things of religion. Nor can I believe that there is any real program of permanent safety for the nation which is moving toward the ideal of the totalitarian state. The objective of society patterned after the American ideal is the enrichment of life for the individual. The essential unit of any program of progressive government is the individual. The Government is organized for the protection of life, liberty, and happiness of the individual; and only in cases of national emergency does the individual exist for the protection of the State. This is the American ideal.

But the Soviet regime may be an improvement over the political and economic conditions of old Russia. The Russians may be better off under their present Government than they were under the autocracy of the Czars. These developments in Russia challenge the attention of thinkers and students of government.



Every alumnus of the University of Michigan can well remember the legend over the platform of old University Hall taken from the ordinance of 1787 for the government of the Northwest Territory:

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

This familiar declaration has been repeated in every draft of the Constitution of the State of Michigan, and is doubtless found in many other State papers.

This is an enlightened age, and the school children of America, including those in the District of Columbia, have inquiring minds, and they will not be thwarted in their search for information regarding current political history. Our public schools have contributed largely to the development and maintenance of the principles of democracy and sportsmanship. These ideals in turn have been responsible for the patient manner in which our people have endured the hardships, privations, and disillusionments of the past 6 years. I want to say that the faculties of our schools and colleges and the pupils of our public-school system should not be insulted, or their intelligence or patriotism questioned, by having laws enacted which are intended to limit and thwart their natural right to information pertaining to national affairs and international politics.

Smallpox and scarlet fever are destructive maladies that afflict the human race. Knowledge concerning ways and means of spreading smallpox is dangerous knowledge in the hands of a ruthless enemy of mankind. But the fact that such information may be used improperly and criminally does not justify a proposal to keep information concerning the disease of smallpox away from the faculty and students of our schools. If a mad dog is running loose in the streets of a neighboring village, it would be sheer folly to destroy all textbooks on the subject of rabies. Instruction about communism is one thing. Advocating its adoption in America is an entirely different matter. Instruction concerning smallpox and the information concerning the meaning of infection are useful and lifesaving, but advocating the use of such method of spreading the disease among human beings would bring prompt imprisonment and criminal prosecution.

There is no common-sense reason for denying to the students of our public schools information about communism and the means by which it is spread. But the advocacy or adopting it, or putting such means into effect in our own Nation is something that can be easily handled without laying ourselves liable to the charge of suppression of free speech, free press, and free people. Let our schools and our pulpits ever remain unfettered agencies for the dissemination of knowledge and information; but let it also be known that the virus of communism is not to be injected into the body politic any more than the serum of smallpox is to be planted in the flesh and blood of our children in the schoolrooms.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the Sisson bill will reach the floor of this House at an early date. The repeal of this rider should be promptly achieved after full and fair discussion on the merits.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAIN. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. In thus entering the lists against the gentleman from Texas, has the gentleman from Michigan, too, lowered his visor?

Mr. MAIN. I am afraid I am not familiar with the terminology used by the gentleman from California, but I am glad to be enlisted along with him, as well as with the gentleman from New York, in opposition to this, the little "red rider."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ].

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening a great deal lately to the controversy on communism. I, too, have been a school teacher in the public schools, and I have yet to meet one teacher who is even sympathetic toward communism.

I came here this afternoon, however, to speak about a remedy for communism, if there is one. You never heard of communism from any citizen who has his heart and his soul centered on his family and his home. Make the people home owners and you will never have any problems along this line, because their hearts and their souls will be wrapped up in their homes and their families. They will be real American citizens. It is only the lodgers, the boarders, and the transients who have tendencies, if you please, to disrupt the Government. Our action here should be toward encouraging the owning of more homes. What have we done? The only bill that has been introduced along this line is one to make the farmer's interest less; namely, the Frazier-Lemke bill, and we cannot even get that up to debate, much less to a vote.

We should pay attention to the owners of homes. In most instances those who pay 6-percent interest cannot pay anything on the principal. They are losing their houses every month. Let me tell you the facts in Pittsburgh. Every month in Pittsburgh, just before the sheriff's sales, the papers carry four pages of houses advertised for sale through distress. This has been going on for at least 3 years, and it means that the home owner who put his life savings of \$2,000 or \$3,000, for example, into a home as an equity, giving a mortgage for \$6,000, is wiped out and ceases to be a home owner. I find no fault with what we have tried to do, namely, the work of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, but, Mr. Chairman, we are not doing anything at all to lessen the burden of interest.

#### THE INJUSTICE OF 6 PERCENT TODAY

The most unfortunate men in the United States are those of the middle class who worked and saved for a rainy day and old age. They did not put their savings into foreign securities or tax-exempt bonds. They put their savings into dwellings and storerooms built by American labor from American material. These men rendered a service to society by supplying homes for those who could not build their own. Most of the buildings have been encumbered with mortgages bearing 6-percent interest. In normal times the owners could pay 6-percent interest and other charges and still have a balance left. That balance was the purchasing power of hundreds of thousands of families, many of them widows, orphans, and aged. Let us see what happened to that purchasing power.

Since the financial crash of 1929 rents have been going down, and during the last 3 years rents have been about 45 percent of the 1929 rates. This drop was not due to overproduction of housing and stores, but to lack of jobs, reduced wages, and bankruptcies. Owners allowed tenants to live for many months, and in some cases years, without paying a single dollar. Many houses and stores have been vacant, and many storekeepers have only been paying a commission of their receipts, which is far from enough to pay 6-percent interest on the mortgage, plus taxes and repairs. In some poor districts the relief agencies paid for the families on relief a rental sufficient to cover only taxes and fire insurance. And so the owners of renting property carried the burden of the peoples' inability to pay rents based on 6 percent for both mortgagee and mortgagor, and there the purchasing power of the owners became only a memory. The money lenders started wholesale foreclosures. In hope of rescuing their life savings invested in buildings, owners sold everything they could and borrowed to the limit on their life insurance—most of them wound up without their life insurance and without their property.

The Federal Government came to the rescue of the man who lived in his small home, millions were poured out to save the railroads, but the hundreds of thousands of citizens who owned renting property on which the family depended for their food, clothing, and other necessities have been left to the tender mercy of the money lenders.

I was informed, on good authority, that more than 75 percent of all rents are now in the possession of the large banks and trust companies. They took it in the following ways: First, by foreclosings; second, by compelling owner to assign his rents to them; third, by simply notifying the tenants that the bank or trust company is mortgagee in possession;



fourth, by compelling the owner to make the real-estate department of the bank agent with full power to handle the property. When the owner signs that agreement he may as well kiss his property good-bye.

While the owners lost control of their property and small real-estate offices lose rent-collection business, the banks benefit by letting their own real-estate desk or department rake off \$5 from every hundred dollars rent that is assigned to them. The banks insure the property in their own agency and earn the commission which formerly was earned by some individual in the insurance business.

The following case is a fair example of the ruthlessness of most of the money lenders in control of concentrated wealth.

A man who owned 16 houses—covered by one mortgage—in which he had an equity of over \$60,000, had this experience. When rents went down and he could not pay his 6-percent interest, the trust company compelled him to assign all rents to them. He, his wife, and four children occupied 1 of the 16 houses, for which he had to pay rent. When he was 4 months behind in his own rent the trust company foreclosed on all the 16 houses, and his family was thrown out on the street.

Thousands of such acts are occurring all over the country. These acts, unfortunately, are legal; but are they just? Are they moral? No; such unfairness is the cause of class hatred and disrespect for law. People cannot understand why a law cannot be framed to stop foreclosures—most of which are legal banditry—until the finances of the country have been put in a normal condition. People cannot understand why the bankers have a right to reduce payment on saving deposits from 4 percent to an average of 2 percent, and mortgagees still insist on the old pound of flesh of 6 percent. The bankers are keen enough to know that present wages and business earnings do not warrant it.

If the racket of mortgage foreclosures is allowed to continue, the time will soon come when 90 percent of our people will be the feudal tenants of the money barons.

Foreclosures not only deprive people of their last hope to salvage something from the financial crash, they do more than that; foreclosures reduce other property to the sheriff-sale price—without reducing the rate of interest. Foreclosures leave on record judgment bonds which destroy the credit and business future of hundreds of thousands of our best citizens. The fear of foreclosure keeps people from making repairs and improvements and will scare people away from building or buying real estate for many years to come.

If mortgagees would now be made to accept 3-percent interest and leave the balance of the 6 percent to the owners, more purchasing distribution and less hoarding would be the blessing granted the forgotten men. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Crowe].

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I shall talk for just a few minutes on the subject of continuance of forest-land acquisition. In neither this country nor any other country is wealth produced where there are no natural resources. Natural resources consist of soil, ores, forest and stream, one of the greatest being forest. Forests can be replaced. We have started late with forest-land acquisition. Our purchases should be accelerated. Denuding the hillsides leaves the soil open to erosion, which fills the channels of streams. The hard earth and stone do not retain the water, so floods are the result, followed by drought. The natural resources must be rebuilt or poverty comes. Forests are the greatest of all natural resources. Ten to twenty years' growth with reasonable cultivation on small timber will produce great amounts of valuable timber. I am interested in seeing a continuance of land purchases for the national forests and national reserves. The water table of the United States has been lowered 6 to 25 feet during the past 25 years, due mostly to removal of forests, grass from the plains, and so forth. It is high time we repair our mistakes. In my State in par-

ticular we have started the acquisition of some 800,000 acres in four districts of approximately 200,000 acres each. About 35,000 acres have been purchased, but they are not contiguous. To make them contiguous 65,000 additional acres have been placed under option. When these options have been taken up and the land purchased this vast acreage can be handled and operated at a minimum of expense; otherwise there will be considerable loss. Roads and firebreaks must be made. Underbrush removed and dead and decayed trees taken out to provide room for a new growth. To leave our areas now purchased and not continue further purchase would be folly.

In addition to that, the farmers who have optioned their land to the Government expect the Federal Government to buy this land. If the land is not bought, they will, therefore, be disappointed. And why should they not be disappointed? We all know an option is simply an option. It does not bind one to buy. However, in case of the Federal Government taking an option it is different. Government agents came into southern Indiana and made known to the poor farmers that they were taking options for the Government and held out the expectation of the Government buying their land. Many went ahead with other programs, made other contracts on the firm belief the Government would exercise the right of their options, and that in due time they would receive their money. The very least that could be done now would be the purchase of the 65,000 additional acres now optioned.

These farmers did not go to the Government agents, in the first place, and ask them to sell the land to them. The Government agents went to these farmers, proposing to buy it, and asked for the option. I have taken this matter up recently with the Secretary, Mr. Wallace, and also with the President of the United States by letter, and I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD copies of these two letters.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 28, 1936.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,

Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WALLACE: I, along with a group of other Congressmen, am interesting myself in the matter of the continuance of the Forest Service, and have been active in asking for \$25,000,000 for its continuance. I believe this program one of the most meritorious, if not the most, of any part of the New Deal program, in that it is laying groundwork for the ultimate restoration of a very substantial part of the resources of our Nation, as far as timber and soil are concerned, and, as you know, these resources have been fast depleted.

Last year, through out efforts, together with work in conjunction with some Members of the Senate, an additional \$12,000,000 was added to the Forest Service, mostly to be used in the purchase of timberlands. This work is now well under way, with many units purchased here and there. To leave it now uncoordinated would result in tremendous loss. A skeleton organization would, of course, be maintained, but the actual results really producing timber and the bettering of the forests would be small unless the program is fully carried out.

Prior to the depression many millions of dollars' worth of logs and lumber were imported into the United States because of the lack of forests and forest lands. I have had reports they have run as high as \$375,000,000 per year along in the years of 1924-26. Whether the amount is that much or more or less, in any event when times are prosperous it amounts to an enormous sum, all of which could be saved, and all of that money could be kept in the United States if our forests would be rebuilt and brought to a maximum growth.

In my state and principally in my district, four large areas have been laid out, in which it has been the purpose to purchase a total of some 800,000 acres of forest lands averaging around or near 200,000 acres to the area. The total purchase to date in these four areas amount to 34,000 acres and nearly equally distributed among the four areas. This, as you will note, is a very small percentage of the total, and these lands purchased, if left at this, would certainly not be in coordinated, compact groups. Many more thousands of acres have been optioned, and it isn't a matter that these people have come to the Government begging to sell their land, but through the agencies of the Government they have been contacted and asked to option their land. To curtail the work at this time, it occurs to me, would be a shameful waste and would give an appearance of starting a thing and not carrying through. Good business requires that good, well-laid-out plans be continued and completed.



This, I submit, is a good and worth-while program and should be completed.

May I not urge upon you that you lend your weight and assistance toward the completion of this program and to the end that sufficient funds may be allocated for this work?

I will appreciate your reply.

Respectfully,

EUGENE B. CROWE, M. C.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., February 24, 1936.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,  
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am much disturbed over reports that the Forest Service is to be greatly reduced in the near future and that the operations of this Service is to be greatly curtailed.

Last year a group of we Members of Congress took the initiative to do some organization in this matter, followed by a conference with some Members of the Senate, and after which a committee of Senators called on you, and following that an additional \$12,000,000 was placed for the use of this Service. This money was most gratefully received and, in my opinion, there is no money which you and this Congress can spend which will go further or do more good than that money has and will do.

May I not respectfully and earnestly request, Mr. President, that no less than \$25,000,000 be set aside for the continuance of this work? Your program of recovery is outstanding. It is bringing results easily seen, I believe, by people in all walks of life and in all forms of endeavor. I believe the Forest Service and your program of conservation of soil, land development, upbuilding of forest and stream, together with the C. C. C. work, is out in front of all the programs which you have laid out. Let us, then, not sidetrack such a splendid program as these two programs, which would give the appearance to the enemy of starting programs and not carrying them out.

For instance, in Indiana 4 areas have been laid out, totaling some 800,000 acres. Of this amount, purchased or in course of purchase, are 34,000 acres. Without a continuance of this program, only a small bit more could be purchased, which would mean that the Federal Government would have spots here and there of small areas, and the plan would ultimately fall through with and become a dismal failure.

I urge, Mr. President, a continuance of this program and a program of going through with the purchase of these thousands and millions of acres of forest lands by the Federal Government. On these lands then belonging to the Federal Government will be room for much labor with which to continue the C. C. C. camps. Let's not, Mr. President, curtail parts of your program which are among the best, if not the best, of your splendid recovery program.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very respectfully,

EUGENE B. CROWE, M. C.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Since I have three national forests in my district, I am vitally interested in this problem. I would like to know if there are further funds available for the purchase of additional land that has already been set aside?

Mr. CROWE. I may say that in the Senate an amendment has been placed in the appropriation bill which will come back to the House conferees. I hope when the conferees consider the amendments which have been placed in this bill by the Senate that they will accept the amendment which provides \$10,000,000 for the purchase or acquisition of various lands in order that the program may continue and not be curtailed tremendously, as it will be without this money. This program is not only important to approximately 100 Members who have forest areas, but it is of great importance to every man, woman, and child in the United States. Not only is that true, but coming generations will rise up and call you blessed.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman realizes, of course, that there are permanent appropriations made every year under the Clarke-McNary Act for this very purpose?

Mr. CROWE. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. Are all funds exhausted at the present time?

Mr. CROWE. The funds are not exhausted at the present time, but nearly so, and there will not be enough to carry forward the program this year.

Mr. SHORT. Does the gentleman think that \$10,000,000 will be a sufficient amount?

Mr. CROWE. Ten million dollars would suffice for the year 1936. Should the conferees successfully resist this \$10,000,000 amendment, then I favor seeking to earmark considerably more than that amount in the coming one and one-half billion relief legislation.

This forest land should be owned by the Government in such amounts as to furnish all possible areas for the men in the C. C. C. camps to have federally owned land to work on. Those men are paid by taxes collected from all the people. Their work as far as possible should be on property owned by all the people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KENNEY].

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, it is the function of government to lend its aid and credit in times of stress. This administration has performed this function. It has rendered yeoman service to agriculture, commerce, industry, and banking. It has given its aid and lent its credit to preserve our varied American institutions.

At the outset of the present administration even the credit of the United States Government was imperiled. But the administration so conducted itself as to bring about a speedy restoration of confidence and the solidarity of the credit of the United States, enabling it to spring to the relief of the States and municipalities and the institutions and people of the country.

Anyone who heard the speech of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture this afternoon can well appreciate what this Government has done for the farmers and those who work on the farms of the Nation and what this administration has done toward saving their farms to the farmers.

Mr. Chairman, our farm and commodity prices have risen. They are quite satisfactory to the farmer at the moment. To maintain them, industry must advance and prosper. Business is better; there is business now where there was little before the advent of this administration. In industry we find a vast improvement. Security prices have climbed up from the depths, standing out favorably in contrast with the collapse of values at the beginning of this administration. This administration has aided industry; but labor is not obtaining its just share of the improvement in business by way of new jobs for our people.

Meanwhile we have provided work for a large army of unemployed. Men accustomed to work must have work, and this administration, even at much expense and cost, has provided jobs for millions who have not been able to obtain work in ordinary fields of employment. To do this costs money, our people's money, making necessary the tapping of new sources of revenue for additional taxes to meet the bills. It is essential, therefore, that Congress lend the aid and do all in its power to promote industry, especially infant industries, as a means of reducing unemployment in industry to a minimum.

The Congress is charged with the duty of solving the unemployment situation. Once that is done we shall have found a cure for all the troubles of this Nation. In order to do that we will have to get people back to work in private industry. In past generations the steamboat, the railroad, and the automobile developed cycles in business. Progress and prosperity followed. So I am of the opinion that aviation will bring about a new business cycle in this country.

But it took years and years for the full development of the railroads, steamboats, and automobiles. We want aviation, an infant industry, to accomplish a needed, speedy development.

We should give special assistance to this new, important industry. Yet we have been doing very little for aviation. The appropriation for the Bureau of Air Commerce this year is \$255,200 more than last year. But last year's appropriation failed of requirements. For instance, in my State at Newark, which is a part of the port of New York district, is located the busiest airport in the country. There is a radio beam south of the airport. But there is none to the north. The result is that we find a bottle-neck condition on foggy days, for all planes from every direction have to go south of



the airport to locate that beam. The large number of planes leaving and landing are consequently subjected to great hazards which should be eliminated by the installation of other radio beams placed at points like Teterboro to the north. The Department of Commerce did not have the funds to provide even one additional beam at a cost of approximately \$16,000, according to information given to me. Whether the appropriation in the bill under debate will aid our air commerce materially remains to be seen.

We must not lose sight of the importance of aviation, to which we should give material assistance and encouragement; nor should we neglect to make provision for the education of our people, especially the youth, as to the ever-growing value of the plane and its uses.

Education has been the cornerstone upon which our business cycles have developed. History records instances where men feared to ride on a railroad train running at a slow rate of speed, and in my time I remember men who were afraid to ride in automobiles going 20 miles an hour.

It is for us to foster and not retard the development in aviation. We can do it in many ways, including the enactment into law of a bill introduced by me in the House authorizing the Commissioner of Education in the Department of the Interior to conduct a study and make available to the public schools of the country an adequate and approved course of instruction in aviation.

The Senate passed the bill last week. We should lose no time in passing it in the House. Only a few days ago word came from Italy that training in aviation for its youth was made compulsory. The purpose behind the law is to build up a reserve body and special technicians. My bill would not be compulsory in any sense, but would provide accurate and comprehensive aviation courses for such schools as might apply for them. Up to now attempts at teaching in the public schools have failed of their objective, save in one instance known to me, and the reason has been the lack of an adequate course, the unwise selection of equipment, and unsuitable textbooks. By encouraging aviation in this way we shall lay a foundation for an air-minded nation, out of which will come pilots and enthusiasts from the schools and technicians from the colleges, whose representatives are meeting here this week at the convention of the National Intercollegiate Flying Conference. Private ownership, perhaps, in volume will follow. Many schools are interested in teaching aviation, but so far only the Teaneck High School in New Jersey, in my district, has been successful in establishing an aviation instruction course. Major Norwood, the instructor in aviation, brought this about. The Government should launch upon the undertaking of outlining a course and keeping it up to date for the benefit of commercial development and national defense.

It is interesting to note the results at Teaneck, where registration for aviation class opened January 1, 1934.

Major Norwood has developed 5 licensed pilots, 20 solo students, and now has 20 dual student pilots. The class is open to only juniors and seniors in the high school. From this may be derived interesting figures as to the possibilities of an adequate and comprehensive course in general use.

Teaneck High School has a total enrollment in the two classes affected of 350 boys. It has produced 25 actual pilots and 20 students of varying amounts of experience. If such a plan should be adopted in the high schools of the Nation, with their 4,000,000 students of these grades, we could produce thousands of pilots who would have in addition to their commercial value, a value for national defense that would make the small cost of development of no consequence.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include a prospectus prepared by Major Norwood which should be of interest to the country. The prospectus is as follows:

#### INTRODUCTION

This prospectus has been prepared with a view of supplying the type of information concerning aviation instruction which has been solicited by letters of inquiry from many parts of the United States and several foreign countries.

For some time educators have considered the advisability of introducing aviation in the modern high-school curriculum. The sporadic efforts in this direction, however, were doomed to failure largely from lack of an adequate course of study, the unwise selec-

tion of equipment, and unsuitable textbooks. Urged by an impelling persistence that extended over a 3-year period when this work was conducted as an extra-curricula activity, the high school at Teaneck, N. J., surmounted these major obstacles, and in January 1934 successfully established a department of aviation in its curriculum.

The success which has attended this course of instruction—from the standpoint of safety, student and parental popularity, quality of instruction, and results obtained accords Teaneck High School the distinction of being the first successful pioneer in the field of aviation training in secondary schools.

#### I. A COURSE IN AVIATION FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

From the very beginning of the public schools in this country there has been an element of progressiveness in education. As long as idealism and practical interest exist among educational thinkers our schools will advance, not keeping step with, but closely following the advancing civilization in which the student must move.

##### THE NEED OF THE COURSE

The student of secondary-school age is intensely interested in the modern trend of the outside world. It is as unfair to insist that he accept the educational program of his father as it would be to ask his father to scrap the telephone, the dictaphone, and modern business equipment and conduct his work as his father did.

With air transport lines flying millions of miles on schedule yearly, passengers and goods moving through the air at high speeds to step up the tempo of modern commerce, our school boys and girls, as future citizens, will require an adequate knowledge of aviation. Shall they be given this information in the high school under proper supervision or will we deny them this and force them to acquire it from unsupervised and often dangerous sources.

The student of today is, in most instances, an intense, serious worker who knows what he wants and is always willing to meet the school half-way if given modern, interesting work to do. He will absorb the instincts of fair play, self-reliance, self-control, and honest workmanship if imparted through subjects which he eagerly desires.

One has only to visit any airport from the large, modern plant to the small "pasture lot" field to recognize that young America is eager to learn the science of flying. Therefore, an adequately planned aviation course, taught by a well-trained teacher, appears to be a desirable unit in any modern secondary-school program.

##### EDUCATION AS ACTIVE PARTICIPATION

Dr. Harold Rugg has said that "Modern pedagogy conceives of subject matter not as a body of printed material to be learned, but as a series of experiences." This is the basic principle which has been applied to the development of our course of study in aviation. The students learn by doing.

First, of course, the student must have a purpose. It must be his purpose, and he must entertain it with enthusiasm. He must be given practical proof of the theories expounded in the classroom, and the work must be so organized and arranged that he will find the actual process of learning an interesting adventure. We have discovered that these elements have functioned effectively in our present course of study.

##### THE CORRELATION OF MANY SUBJECTS

By the very nature of the science of aeronautics it is necessary that the student of aviation have a general knowledge of many other subjects. The Teaneck Course in Aviation has been developed with this thought in mind. An effort has been made to correlate the units of the course with those subjects of the regular curriculum to which they are allied. For example, in the unit on aerodynamics, Boyle's law, as taught in the subject of physics, is applied to air flow; Newton's law of motion, to airfoil action; the law of levers, to stabilizer action, etc. In the unit on aircraft structure, the subject of physics is again correlated with such topics as the strength of truss forms, tensile strength of metals, etc.

The general school work is further correlated and amplified by the practical application of high-school algebra to the solution of lift-drag formulas; the application of geometric theorems to length and shape problems of aircraft structure. Chemistry enters into the fuel and lubrication studies; geology is made more alive in the work done in airport and general terrain survey, as well as in the study of "surface conditions affecting the aircraft compass."

Hygiene as taught in school work is applied in the practice of keeping the body in proper condition for the demands made upon it by flight, while the regular work in English is augmented by frequent practice in the development and delivery of technical papers before the class and the defense of theories in debate.

Not only is the element of correlation utilized in our present course of study, but an effort has also been made to utilize methods of presentation used by the teachers in the above-mentioned subjects of the regular school curriculum. Unless this is done, confusion will result in the minds of the students, and their understanding of the scientific and mathematical processes and solutions will be rendered more difficult.

##### II. THE CONTENT OF THE COURSE

In organizing the material for this course special attention has been given to the problem of selecting only such material as will vitalize the work and appeal to the student's interest. The selection of such material has also been so organized that the average student of secondary-school age will find the subject matter not too advanced for his high-school level, but also profitable to the extent to which it is pursued.



## AERODYNAMICS

One of the major units of this course covers the field of aerodynamics. This unit is designed to give the student a complete knowledge of the properties of air, both static and dynamic. He is also taught the law of gasses, Newton's laws of motion and their application to the moving air stream about an airfoil, and the recognition that air as a definite body is capable of supporting weight and offering resistance to motion.

The student is further given an understanding of the various types of airfoils, and the general form of airfoils is studied so that students may learn their use. The action of stabilizing airfoils is experimentally determined, and a complete study made of the law of levers as applied to the solution of design problems in stabilizer size and section. An aerodynamic balance is used in the laboratory to demonstrate the lift-drag ratio of several types of airfoils and to observe the changing affect of speed, as well as the angle of attack. With this equipment the students are also enabled to note the design and use of control surfaces.

## AIRCRAFT STRUCTURE

Another unit of the course covers aircraft structure which is so treated as to give the student an understanding of how and why each part is constructed in the conventional manner. This unit considers the various stresses and strains to be met in operation, the truss system of bracing, the factor of safety and general structure. The tubing system is studied in relation to its diagonal and longitudinal members. Various tests are made on strength of materials, bolted and welded fittings, and such specialized subjects as hydraulic shock absorbers, control-operating systems, rigging wires, and struts.

## METEOROLOGY

Meteorology, being most important to the airman, is also incorporated in the course of study. The student is given a thorough knowledge of the expansion of gasses with heat, and is enabled to understand why unequal distribution of heat over the surface of the earth is the primary cause of air flow and weather. Thermal and contour currents are studied as well as relative and actual humidity; the formation of rain, hail, sleet, and snow; cloud formations with their cause and indications; and the formation and movement of areas of high and low pressure are observed over long periods.

The student is taught to analyze a weather map as issued by the Government, considering such points as movement of "lows", wind direction and velocity, temperature, position of isobars, dew point, and cloud formations. At the conclusion of this study each student is required to report on the conditions expected along a definite line of flight over an 8-hour period.

## AVIGATION

Realizing that avigation is a subject often neglected in flight schools, this unit has been developed to a complete study of three systems: piloting, dead reckoning, and celestial avigation. The student is taught the methods used in projecting various types of maps and charts, the interpretation of the airway map and the running sheet, and technique of map and chart work. The compass is studied in relation to its errors and limitations, and in relation to the use of the watch and airspeed indicator in "dead reckoning."

Considerable time is given to the study of the earth's division into degrees of longitude and latitude and the relation of longitude to time. The sextant and chronometer are used to solve problems in nautical astronomy, and adequate practice is afforded in their use to enable the student to become proficient in locating position by the sun or stars, measuring heights by triangulation, and surveying airports.

## POWER PLANTS

While it is not felt that the engineer or pilot need have a detailed knowledge of the actual work of maintaining his power plant, he should understand the theory of its operation and know the name and function of each part. With this in mind a power plant unit has been added to the course. With the use of a model engine the student is taught the cycle of operation, and a complete aircraft power plant is disassembled and reassembled so that the student has a thorough knowledge of the structure, position, and use of each part. Regular inspection and simple adjustments are made by groups of students after various maladjustments have been made and recorded by the instructor; and the student is taught to make proper entries in the engine and ship log books as required by the Government.

## III. THE GENERAL OUTCOMES OF THE COURSE

With the unprecedented advance of air transport today, touching as it does every phase of social and business activities, no person can afford to remain ignorant of at least some background of aviation knowledge; this course has been built about four major objectives or outcomes—the cultural, scientific, vocational, and physical.

## THE CULTURAL OUTCOME

Any person can obtain a better appreciation of the beauties of the earth and the grandeur of nature from experiences encountered while in flight practice. The knowledge, habits, and skill developed in such work will go far in the formation of such character traits as confidence, open-mindedness, tolerance, and judgment. Then, too, these elements will be irresistibly reflected in his social, economic, and political life.

## THE SCIENTIFIC OUTCOME

For the student of science this course acts as a preparation for advanced work in such subjects as properties of materials, mechanics, action of gases, applied mathematics, and many allied subjects. The presentation of such subjects as physics, astronomy, chemistry, and trigonometry in a practical manner, covered with the sugar coating of interest, will develop habits of study which will be of great value in college or engineering school.

## THE VOCATIONAL OUTCOME

For the student who cannot pursue his studies further in the university, this course will lay a definite foundation for a career in aviation; as it takes the student through the primary stage of flight training and through all the theory needed for a pilot's license. A student should be able to leave high school with a commercial pilot's license and be prepared to enter at once into productive aviation.

## THE PHYSICAL OUTCOME

No one who has observed the aviation class in advanced stages can doubt the value, from a physical standpoint, of this type of training. The very nature of the work, with its constant activity in the clean, pure air of the higher altitudes, together with the knowledge that a pilot must keep fit for quick thinking and mental-muscular coordination, all combine to develop the students in clean-living, cool-headed, bright-eyed youngsters who are living.

## THE COMMERCIAL VALUE OF THE COURSE

When one compares the value received from this course with the total cost there is no doubt of its desirability. When we think of it in terms of preparation for engineering colleges, as preliminary training for actual self-support, as an asset in general business and social life, and as a method of developing a sound body and the habit of keeping it sound, its commercial value becomes evident.

## IV. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE COURSE

In this work the most powerful force known to educators is called into service, namely, that the student learns by doing. The power of interest, with its accompanying desire for knowledge, is used to its fullest extent, and the principles of growth are fully provided for. The practice in skill enters into the actual flight training, and the entire course has been built along the unit system, making the course profitable to the extent to which it is pursued. And, finally, the grade placement of materials has been so arranged that the work is at all times coordinated with the general school work.

## V. THE TEACHER AND THE COURSE

To accomplish the best results in this specialized subject the administration must give careful thought to the selection of the instructor. He must have a thorough knowledge of the practical as well as the theoretical side of aviation. He must be, by law, a transport pilot with a Federal license for instruction of students in flight. But this is not enough. He must understand and like young people; he must understand classroom work, and be first and always a teacher.

The size of the classes should be controlled by the facilities at hand, but it has been found that classes composed of a greater number than 35 students cannot be handled with the proper degree of efficiency. Therefore it is suggested that classes be composed of not more than 30 carefully selected students.

## VI. MATERIALS NEEDED FOR COURSE

Contrary to general opinion, the material needed for classroom work is not costly. Much of the laboratory equipment of a modern high school may be adapted to aeronautical use, and the few pieces of special equipment needed may be procured at any airport or constructed in the school shop.

## FIELD WORK

For field work in aviation the class needs only a "school type" bubble sextant, two cheap watches for use as chronometers, and a supply of maps, charts, and plotting sheets that may be purchased from the Government at low cost.

## SPECIAL AERONAUTICAL MATERIAL

Such special material as wing ribs, fuselage sections, spars, hydraulic shock cylinders, rubber shock cords, etc., may be procured by the pilot-instructor without cost, and the other special material may be procured at extremely low cost if the material list as given in the course outline is followed closely.

## FLIGHT MATERIAL

While the flight section must use only the best equipment to be had, the cost need not be excessive. At the present time there are several good, light airplanes on the market that are strong enough for the punishment of student flight and inexpensive to operate and maintain. Such airplanes have the further advantage of being hard enough to handle to really train the student to fly.

## GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Every student enrolled in the first-year course must have passed his fifteenth birthday, submit his parent's consent in writing, and pass a satisfactory physical examination by the school physician. Every student enrolled in the second-year course must have completed the first-year work with an average of "C" or better and comply with the requirements of the United States Government for a student pilot's permit. These requirements necessitate appearance before an Army doctor for a physical examination. A fee of \$10 is charged for this examination, the cost of which is



assumed by the student. The Government requires, in addition, that every student must have passed his sixteenth birthday.

The Teaneck course is open to eleventh- and twelfth-grade students only. The first-year course is given five periods per week, and the second-year course is given three periods per week with an additional two periods of laboratory or "field work."

An occasional exception, however, is made where a tenth-grade student who complies with the Federal requirements and who would in the judgment of the high-school principal profit by such a course is permitted to enroll in aviation I.

#### VII. CONCLUSION

The work in Teaneck High School has passed the preliminary experimental stage and is now an accepted part of the industrial arts department. Although Teaneck is at this time the only community in the United States having such a course in the public-school system, other communities will eventually be forced by general demand to incorporate such a course.

The Teaneck course has passed through its first stage of research and experimentation and is now presented for further development as a definite unit of work. A program of development is under way which will shortly make available to all schools a complete guide to the organization of similar courses.

This course will be complete, consisting of a syllabus, a teachers' guide, a laboratory manual, an equipment and material list, class and field log books, flight instruction schedule, student record cards, and a complete cost-accounting system.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an outline of a course in aviation as prepared by Major Harwood.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

#### THE PASSING OF THE KENTUCKY COLONEL

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, while I have been allotted this time I am not going to take it, due to the lateness of the hour and the anxiety of the Members for adjournment. While I myself am not a Kentucky colonel at this particular moment, I want to do the gallant thing and extend my remarks in reference to the passing of the Kentucky colonel, instead of taking up the time of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, they say it never rains but it pours. Hitler occupied the Rhineland and upset the world. Queer actions of a minor star has disturbed astronomers. The Supreme Court plays havoc with beneficial legislation. Extreme winter weather did millions of damage to the highways. The floods brought national disaster. And now, to climax the list of catastrophes and to show that dire calamity is no respecter of persons, comes the startling news that there are no more Kentucky colonels. The weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth is heard around the world.

How the mighty have fallen is a tragedy worthy of our deep and solemn consideration. The sad news comes to people scattered in the 48 States and across the waters as a death warrant is received by the doomed. Yesterday the sturdy oak kissed the heavens with its branches and passing multitudes paused and marveled at its grandeur and tower of strength accumulated in the century. We look again and some ruthless hand has laid it low, and the rubbish upon the ground marks its fall. So it is with the Kentucky colonels. Last week they went forth with marshal splendor, glittering with honors bright like plumed knights, sallying forth in all their vanity for deeds of valor well done. Today they are crestfallen and cowed with a hunted, weird, sickly look and a "possum grin", conscious of their sudden humiliation and demotion.

Even our beloved Speaker and Sergeant at Arms look sad and dejected from some unknown reason.

It is said, "The jingle of the guinea helps the hurt that honor feels", but no rattle of shekels could ever serve in lieu of the wounded pride of a real Kentucky colonel. Even an act of Congress to restore the blasted titles would perhaps be invalid. All of which reminds us that the flower

hath its season, and man is of but a few days and full of trouble.

Like fighting cocks, they sallied forth in the morning, but with the death knell of titles worthy, they exhibit now only a bloody comb, lost spurs, a broken bill, and drooping feathers.

A few days ago the attorney general of Kentucky announced a ruling that brought poignant sorrow to several thousand citizens of the country. He said the power to confer the title of colonel by the Governor no longer existed. His views of the law were that the titles conferred were null and void at the expiration of the term of the Governor conferring the honorary title. He expressed grave doubt as to any authority conferred on the Governor to bestow the title.

The present Governor is not interested, inasmuch as he has made no such appointments. The story behind this story is one of chivalry, romance, and ideal patriotism. There were at one time many real Kentucky colonels, dating back to the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Civil War, back to the days of George Rogers Clark, who took from the British the Northwest Territory, or the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and part of Wisconsin, and without such efforts the Canadian boundary would today extend to the Ohio River, and this august body would be deprived of the pleasant associations and recognized ability of the Members from those States.

In those days a Kentucky colonel was an outstanding man of his particular community and frequently raised a company of men to assist in some patriotic governmental function, and he was given a title which recognized his services.

The title of Kentucky colonel, today made a joke by reason of many indiscriminate awards, had behind it for a hundred years a real meaning known around the world, and made the title one of distinction and coveted desires. The terms have been used in laudatory remarks over the world, "as chivalrous, gallant, hospitable, brave, and courteous as a Kentucky colonel." These words described the real Kentucky colonel and made the title a mark of distinction.

Then, when the game of war ceased to furnish the opportunity of the title, it was for awhile awarded sparingly but deservedly on citizens who had distinguished themselves on any great undertaking, such as authors, musicians, or even athletic superiority. It was even then a recognition of some form of distinguished services. Movie actors of renown, philanthropists, statesmen, physicians, and others, even to the owner of the horse that could win the Kentucky Derby, received the coveted and distinguished title.

The original Kentucky colonels in actual life were the type of men you would delight in knowing and whose acquaintance would be a beautiful memory that you could not forget. As is often the case—that brain, brawn, and big heart are found in the same man—it was universally true with the Kentucky colonels. Tall, straight as an Indian, suave, musical voice, courteous in the extreme, chivalrous, and gallant, with highest respect for womankind, yet beneath it all a pride in truth, honesty, and integrity.

Patient in receiving an affront or insult but when aroused a swift dynamo in retaliation. Henry Clay, once the distinguished Speaker of this House and Minister to England, and a duelist if challenged, was a typical example.

The colonel as fancied and pictured by the world, and not far from correct in detail, was about 6 feet 4, erect, gray hair and mustache, a pistol in belt and able to draw and hit the center of a dime at 50 yards with the swiftness of a sleight-of-hand action. His home was hospitality personified, with a barrel of aged liquor for which the State was famous, a saddle horse that he prized almost as much as one of the family, a pack of fox hounds, and occasionally a violin, which had been in the family for generations. He was gentle yet firm, diplomatic yet positive, never sought to hunt trouble but quick to resent an intended wrong. His tenacity he acquired from his Anglo-Saxon heritage. Kentucky today has the largest number of people of pure unadulterated Anglo-Saxon blood of any State of the Union. It has less than one-half of 1 percent of foreign blood. They left



Virginia early and went over the hill and there in the pocket with the Ohio on one side, the Mississippi on the other, and the Alleghenies to their backs they reproduced their own kind to fill the hills and valleys, in a manner shut off from the seaboard States.

A noted song writer was seeking the old folk songs of England of 500 years ago but could not find them in England. She came to the hills of Kentucky where she found them all, which had come down by the generations by word of mouth without printed form. She had them reproduced by phonograph to get the tune and words and then wrote the music from the records. Among these people we have no fear of communism, they are all just old-fashioned Americans, orthodox Democrats and Republicans.

The abuse of this conferring the title in the past 15 years caused a protest in Kentucky. Men of distinction and renown, and who were justly proud of their title, were humiliated to see it bestowed indiscriminately and they removed their once coveted treasure from sight in office or private library. And if the attorney general's ruling be correct, that title expires with each outgoing Governor and none have been granted by the present Governor, then there is not a Kentucky colonel by legal title in all the world, except those of the Army. But down in Kentucky the woods are full of Kentucky colonels though not decorated with the title. If touring there stop at a farmhouse and ask for water or directions, or any other accommodations for your car or self, and you will find them. Not until the coming of through highways and foreign travel were the doors ever locked at night.

The neighbors are still the best neighbors in all the world to live by. They still follow the ancient custom to lay aside their own work to attend to the needs of a sick neighbor and to do his needed chores for him. Their conscience would hurt them not to do otherwise and the sick neighbor would feel aggrieved at the lack of interest otherwise. Every move they make is written up and magnified around the world and items of no importance in any other State is heralded around the world when it happens in Kentucky. You can tell these modern-day Kentucky colonels, children, and grandchildren of the titled colonels, wherever you see them. They are exceedingly easy to approach and engage in conversation. They arise to give the lady a seat in the streetcar or bus when others sit. Their friendship is easily obtained and also their undying loyalty. They have a sporting sense of fair play, which makes them always for the underdog, be it a prizefight or chicken fight. They will stop and haul a hitchhiker when all others pass him up. They will keep a stranger in their home where others refuse. They are easy victims to hard-luck stories, whether meritorious or not. They are perhaps more clannish than the people of any other State of the Union—once a Kentuckian always a Kentuckian. When meeting abroad as strangers an introduction as a Kentuckian to a Kentuckian is sufficient recommendation to insure the highest degree of respect from each other, regardless of politics, religion, trade, or profession. If the people of the 48 States had that degree of loyalty and fellowship toward each other that the Kentucky colonel and his children have for each other, there would be no danger of harm coming to us from without or within our borders.

The title of Kentucky colonel may be null and void, but the spirit of big-hearted, hospitable, patriotic colonels still thrives in the valleys and on the hillsides of old Kentucky and in the veins of the pure Anglo-Saxon blood of its citizens.

This is not the time or place for extended remarks on Kentucky's long list of gallant men whose lives have been valuable contributions to the Republic, but paraphrasing a little, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the home of ancient and modern Kentucky colonels, is not the oldest nor yet the youngest, not the richest nor yet the poorest, but all in all the best place this side of heaven that the good Lord ever made.

Kentucky colonels, officially, are no more, but their traits of character still rule Kentucky.

The titles conferred did no harm if they did no good. Who can say that the title when conferred on some native

Kentuckian did not give him a pride in it that caused him to live up to the worthy title?

It was formerly awarded as a mark for distinguished services of some kind similar to medals of honor awarded by many other governments.

The world says good-bye to Kentucky colonels, but may their emulation in patriotic chivalry never cease.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, namely:

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARLAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12098) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of the conference on the part of the House on the legislative appropriation bill, was unavoidably called away this afternoon, and in his absence and in his name I desire to present the conference report on the bill for printing under the rule.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

#### NOTRE DAME CEREMONIES COMMEMORATING THE BIRTH OF A NATION

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an address delivered by Carlos P. Romulo, who represented the Republic of the Philippines at the special convocation at Notre Dame University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on December 9 last there was a special convocation at the University of Notre Dame in honor of the new Commonwealth of the Philippines. It was one of the most unique and significant celebrations that ever took place under auspices of the great university, whose fame extends around the world. In respect to its historical setting and implications it was an occasion without a parallel. A brilliant array of members of the hierarchy and distinguished officials and laymen, with the President of the United States as a participant and guest of honor, conducted ceremonies of the most impressive character involving church and state, the purpose being to herald the birth of a new nation in the far-away Orient.

Beautiful and colorful, solemn and thrilling were the rites commemorating this new addition to the family of nations. It was an occasion that will linger forever in the memory of those who were fortunate enough to be present. Originally scheduled to coincide with the inauguration of President Quezon, the Notre Dame ceremonies were postponed to make it possible for President Roosevelt to participate personally in the observance.

His Excellency, Governor Paul V. McNutt, of Indiana, was the civil host. His Eminence, George Cardinal Mundelein, archbishop of Chicago and highest ranking ecclesiastic west of the Allegheny Mountains, presided. The degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa, was conferred on President Roosevelt and Carlos P. Romulo, the representative of the Philippines, who was sent to America to speak for the new-born nation.

The thoughtful and eloquent speeches that were delivered during the ceremonial were broadcast over two national networks and were heard in every part of the continent. It is not my purpose here and now to review the program



in detail, or to dwell upon the many interesting events and episodes of the great occasion, but rather it is my purpose to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives and the country the masterful address made by Carlos P. Romulo, who traversed thousands of miles of sea and land in order that he might voice the sentiments of the Philippine people as they stand on the threshold of freedom. Mr. Romulo is an eminent journalist, orator, educator, and public servant who has had a leading part in the establishment of the newest nation.

Rev. John F. O'Hara, C. S. C., president of Notre Dame University, who holds a position of highest eminence among educators and who is outstanding among men of erudition and religious attainments, presented Mr. Romulo to the vast audience that taxed the capacity of the gymnasium. In doing so he touched a tender chord when he referred to the close ties that unite the University of Notre Dame to the Philippine Islands, as members of many of the most distinguished families in the islands have been students at the university. The subject of Mr. Romulo's address was *The Mind of a New Commonwealth*, and he spoke as follows:

One would be dull of wit, indeed, and slow of heart who could be unresponsive to the fortunate coincidence of historic influences brought to this occasion at Notre Dame. I refer to the apt confluence of the faith and freedom that have streamed through the history of the Philippines, nurturing our people to the maturity of independence. Today both are given representative testimony in a joint gesture of remembrance and the concerned congratulation of amicable hope.

His Excellency, the President of the United States, bespeaks the freedom of a nation dedicated to the proposition that all men, and all groups of men, are created equal before the law; a nation which controls itself through democratic institutions so designed as to serve evenly the rights of all—their liberties and opportunities; that each may live without servitude and without envy; protected in domestic security and confirmed in the inalienable, proprietary powers of citizens.

The sovereignty of this Republic is shared by all, possessed by none, that the authority of government may never be presumptive or arbitrary but only representative and revocable. A democracy may vote away its powers—as it has in Germany and, recently, in Greece; but a republic cannot do likewise without ceasing to exist. In the United States freedom is not limited to the franchise of suffrage but extended to all elements of political and social function. The state, then, can never become coequal with the community; as could be if processes of government were accepted as embracing the structure and form of society. The community is greater, as well as antecedent to, the state. It creates the state to control and order its multiple interests; interests which citizens never relinquish whether to kings, princes, or parliaments. To mistake this relation, to misread the genealogy of government, is to induce the subservience of the popular to the governmental will. "Of the people, by the people, for the people", is, therefore, a prepositional summary of the concept of that freedom which the United States enjoys and which, with singular magnanimity, it has conveyed and bequeathed to the Filipino people.

Among a people so naturally disposed as the Filipinos to independence, this doctrine of freedom, taught with the conviction of discovery, found widespread and lively acceptance. Small wonder that we should have desired for ourselves what the Americans taught was the preeminent blessing of national existence!

There are some now, however, who would caution us (and not imprudently) that autonomy may prove precipitate; that we are unskilled in statecraft; lacking the consciousness of organic unity; infantile in the arbitrament of arms; that we are economically overweighed by the past preferment of export; in short, that freedom may mean famine, if it will not mean worse.

To such counsel of caution we reply that freedom is an essential condition of national, as of individual, expression. The Revolutionary Americans so believed and, risking all, died in the hallowed name of liberty. Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, Saratoga are the immortal watchwords of an ideal and a lasting record of its price. The Filipinos, too, have their battlefields of freedom and they shall bear, I trust, with equanimity the trials that independence imposes. Indeed, misfortune and dangers are but the transient, if inescapable circumstances of living; to strive to overcome them is to live valiantly. We desire no more.

And in our freedom, we shall be fortified by that faith which outlasts because it transcends time. This greater heritage of the vast majority of our people is given witness today by Notre Dame and the prelates of the Catholic Church. Like freedom, faith reached us through conquest. Centuries ago, with the crown of Spain came the cross of Christ; both borne on the vehement and masterful exuberance of those dauntless adventurers who foreshortened the earth. They sought silver for their king and subjects for their God. Among us they found both. But the crown was really buried with them; we have almost forgotten how or when. The cross remains throughout our islands, a symbol and an evidence of the radical culture of our minds.

For no one can believe human life foreshadows, through mysteries, a more ample and intimate existence with God; no one can believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God who saved us by His death and sanctifies us by His Sacrament; no one can believe himself a conscious soul under the commandment of Divine love; no one, I repeat, can believe these things without having altered profoundly the quality of his thought and the direction of his outlook. Such belief is a tradition among the Filipinos. It distinguishes us among the peoples of the Far East; and it will be a vital, creative agent in the formation of our new nation. By this, I do not wish to imply that Catholicism is the religion of the State. It is much more; it is the religion of the people. And the people, not the State, are sovereign. To constrain religion as an instrumentality of government and to adopt the anomalous thing called "State religion" is to consider religion falsely and abandon it, as contemporary events elsewhere prove, to the mercy of a government which may not be representative of the people whom it rules. To permit the State to adopt a religion is to concede to the State its potential extension to all functions of society; it is to conceive the State as the ultimate framework of the social organisms. The contrary is, of course, true in the very nature of things. Government, unless it be tyranny, is but an instrument variously chosen by the community for its own social purposes.

So the Philippine constitution instructs its future government that there shall be freedom of worship, indicating thereby that its power shall be limited to control manifestations affecting public discipline; and indicating, too, that the practice of religion shall in no way be considered as dependent on legislative concession. The phrase "freedom of worship" places religion outside the basic law rather than within it; and properly so, since a constitution is projected to restrict government, not society.

The Catholic faith will be, accordingly, free to inspire, develop, and modify our institutions conformably to its supreme law of charity. Through charity we should achieve obedience without servility; authority without autocracy; justice without favoritism; equality of respect without the anarchy of no distinctions. A legalistic mechanism never has been, nor will be, devised to attain per se the ends of social justice. Nor are these ends furthered substantially, as some maintain, by racial temperament, geographical position, or contingent relationships. Only the assurance of Christian charity enables us to forecast the direction that the exercise of sovereignty will take; faith, then, gives sustenance to our freedom.

Graced with this double gift of constructive forces, the Philippine Commonwealth initiates a new national effort for the realization of an ordered and equivalent society. It would be presumptuous to say we shall achieve it; it would be supine not to try. We shall begin our task with an enthusiasm sobered by historical perspective. If we are a new-born nation, we are not, thereby new born to the perception of realities. We can be careful not to be misled by ardent apostles of fatuous panaceas, infallible in appearance because tested only against the unanswering vacuity of their author's minds. We can be docile before facts and mindful that systems, however finely sculptured, can be broken by inordinate hearts and tempestuous wills. We can put forth a modest, well-principled effort to approximate a solution of the harassing problem of economic balance and distribution.

Until lately the Philippines had a plantation economy such as once obtained in the Southeastern States of the Union. Now, we have moved, though in a limited degree, toward the complexities of agrarian and industrial capitalism. There is, in capitalism, much that is still immature and, therefore, maladjusted to the existing social order.

But there is nothing inherently vicious in capitalism. This pooling of wealth for production needs to be counterbalanced by pooling of resources of consumption; only so, can capitalism be wholesome and beneficial. We do not share the views of those who would prevent the acquirement of wealth by distributing it gratuitously. We believe such a process would either destroy wealth for all or concentrate it in the hands of some group who would call themselves, euphemistically, the State.

We do not accept the Marxian dialectic that classes are economically formed and that the road to security is through the liquidation of those classes in favor of the proletariat. Every oriental knows that there is scarcely any proletariat in the Far East; and knows, too, that classes are formed there by educational discrimination as in China, by social heredity as in Malaya, by religious modalities as in India where no amount of acquired wealth would warrant infringement of class privileges. True, the Far East is mildly sensitive to communism but not because the Far East is class conscious; rather because it is land conscious. Communism in the East is not a philosophy; it is an illegitimate hope for unearned increment. Economic class warfare is a myth of the Communists. But economic conflict, as a disorder of the whole social body, is no myth and we shall strive to eliminate it from our Commonwealth by what I have referred to as a modest, well-principled effort.

The approach to this must be realistic; not patronizing and crusading. It is grandiose and anarchical nonsense to pretend that all elements of society must enjoy equality of identity. "Every man a king" is the motto of a fool's paradise and the catch-phrase of political trumpery. There is in society a natural diversity of gifts and function, and where there is distinction of ability, there will be distinction of reward. The coalescing of sundry groups composes the pattern of communal living; and communal living is not an artificial result produced by one class for its own advantage but the inevitable expression of man's social character.



Accordingly, we believe economic factors possess social as well as individual significance. Men are not free to ignore these; nor have we the power by legislative fiat to abolish them. We shall maintain, then, that ownership is a right derived from nature, not from law, and its use or misuse cannot destroy, or cause to be forfeited, the right itself. Wealth invested in capital should have a return but the return should be related to the economy of the nation current at the period of the deposition. Income should be as thermal as the discount rate. A fixed interest or a fixed wage for profit, determined over any but a short period is obviously unsocial, since economic conditions will have altered before the loan or the contract has expired. Contracts for interest or labor once outmoded destroy the equilibrium of the economic field in which the incidence of their fulfillment occurs. The fixed element in economics should be the equation of justice; the variable element is price.

Like ownership and its rewards labor, too, has its social obligations. Labor must attain its individual rights without infringement of the common good. It is false that the worth of labor is the worth of its net result; false that labor exercised on the property of another begets ownership; false even that all profits not needed for repair and replacement belong to the workingman. To assert the contrary is to lose sight of the social aspect of labor and the right of ownership. But labor does create a right to profit-sharing—a right that is again individual and social. It is the right of labor to share in profits on the basis of a living wage. If capital does not pay this, social justice demands that employment be prohibited. But if employers cannot pay this because of unfair competition or unethical imposition of taxes, then the controlling laws of the State should be abrogated.

Such considerations will form the basis of our principled effort to obtain the peace of economic security within our own country.

But for the assurance of that larger peace which depends not on us but on the nations of the world, we must await a more enlightened internationalism. In international affairs, the Darwinian theory seems still to persist though long since dispossessed from its native habitat in biology. The survival of the fittest appears to be the law of national existence and actions which, in the domestic ambient, would be corrected by police power, are glorified and given the support of armies in the international arena. When will we learn to apply to nations the same principles of morality we apply to individuals? When will we learn that nations, as well as men, are created equal before the law? Until we do, all nations, the great as well as the small, are in jeopardy; the great may repel invasion, they have yet to succeed in repelling war. The present competition for mathematical equality is a trepidating evidence of mutual distrust and a proof of reliance in strength for the enforcement of claims. We must inveigh against and deplore the conditions which warrant this cynicism of preparedness. And I venture to propose that, of these conditions, the most pernicious is the prevailing concept of the State as a political and economic, rather than a moral, entity. When Louis Quatorze said, "I am the State", he at least made the state a responsible person. Today, state absolutism is impersonal and neuter. Unless this is corrected, the Congress of nations will continue to be regulated by a diplomatic, rather than a moral, code; governments will be recognized as great or small; the voice of power, instead of truth, will continue to be the decisive voice; and the freedom of little nations will depend on their ability to remain unnoticed or undesirable.

Against the aggression of arms, the Philippines will have no fortress on land or sea. Competitive armament would be a tragic error. The only defense of the Philippines will be its spirit—its articulated cultural unity which will give it protection in the indestructible integration of character. If war comes, or fresh conquest from whatever source, we shall oppose it to the death; but we shall oppose it alone. We shall not ask the shedding of another's blood to spare our own. We shall not make the Philippines the Serajevo of another world Armageddon. Let no one fear it. To the Philippines, the United States has been a generous benefactor; a loyal and true friend; and if, Mr. President, we can honor that debt in no other way, we can pay with our lives, if need be, lest any act of ours should be a prelude to the weeping of American mothers for their dead. We are a poor nation but not, I hope, without valor and gratitude.

We have requested independence; the American people have granted it. So let it be; and may it prove a blessing for both and a pledge of friendship through the years that are to come. We shall go forward bulwarked with abiding faith in God; confident of the particular good will of the United States and the amity of our far eastern neighbors; and we shall take our place glorying in our freedom, with restrained courage, ambitious of peace, with malice toward none and with charity toward all.

We thank you, Mr. President, prelates, the faculty of Notre Dame, for the honor you have, this day, conferred upon us and we bring to each and all the expression of high regard and cordial esteem from the Hon. Manuel Quezon, President of the Philippine Commonwealth.

BOAKE CARTER

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short radio address by Boake Carter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Boake Carter, March 24, 1936:

#### IRELAND SWEEPSTAKES

The scene, the town hall at Dublin, Ireland. The date, today. The time, morning. Scenery, much Americana—the American eagle, seals from the 48 States, flags. Round large drums swept many pretty Irish lassies, representing many American characters and customs. A parade by more Irish beauties, representing stars from Hollywood.

The action provided by Lord Mayor Byrne, of Dublin—he spent a large portion of his address in eulogizing the United States and United States citizens. The time was at hand for the draw. A pretty lass drew a name from the tens of thousands of tickets in her drum. The name was read out. It was the name of an American. It was a New Yorker. Thunderous cheers. The drawing proceeded. Americans averaged 50 percent of the counterfoils drawn out of the box. Thunderous cheers any time an American name was drawn; and why not; for once again it was the annual draw of the chances on the famous Grand National Steeplechase, to be run Friday, the sweepstakes again staged by Irish promoters for the Free State hospitals. Twelve and a half million dollars are the stakes. At the end of the day 718 names were drawn—325 went to Americans and 246 to Europeans. Seven million dollars will be divided among these ticket holders. The major prize is for half a million dollars. A great spectacle dominated by the Stars and Stripes in Dublin.

And why shouldn't the Irish cheer every time an American name was drawn from the drums? In 4 years the Free State Hospitals have benefited to the tune of roughly \$30,000,000. Of that total, Americans have contributed the lion's share. The Free Staters know that the more Americans contribute the better off will be their hospitals and cheaper treatment for sick people in the Free State. It would be pretty nice if American hospitals could have counted \$30,000,000 in their jeans in the last 4 years. We are, however, much too moral to permit such a thing—even Government supervised and inspected. We let a thousand rackets flourish from coast to coast, but we look in righteous smugness upon a sweepstake. Congressman EDWARD A. KENNEY, of New Jersey, once introduced a bill for a Government-operated and supervised sweepstakes, but the bill was turned down. It was, after all, much too simple, realistic, and common sensical to get by. So annually the Free Staters in Dublin get together, put on a big show, splash the United States all over the town hall, and give thanks to Uncle Sam's simple generosity in providing for one of the best hospital systems in the world. And who gainsays them? Uncle is such a nice, simple soul, after all.

#### VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from Gen. Frank T. Hines in regard to the veterans' statement I placed in the RECORD a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in regard to the veterans' statement I placed in the RECORD recently:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, April 2, 1936.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATMAN: I have read with interest the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1936, particularly your extension of remarks giving information concerning benefits available to veterans and their dependents under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies, including the War Department and Civil Service.

I am most appreciative of your help in getting before Congress and the veterans this information. In pamphlet form it should be most valuable to all interested in this problem.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANK T. HINES, Administrator.

#### CIVILIZATION BEGINS AND ENDS WITH THE FLOW

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a brief editorial with reference to the farm situation by my friend the distinguished west Texan, Hon. Jess Mitchell, editor of the Muleshoe Journal, of Muleshoe, Tex., in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by



Hon. Jess Mitchell, editor of the Muleshoe Journal, of Muleshoe, Tex.:

[From the Muleshoe (Tex.) Journal of Feb. 27, 1936]

**THE FARMERS' DECLARATION OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE—"CIVILIZATION BEGINS AND ENDS WITH THE PLOW"**

When in the course of the life of any nation, its people become flagrantly selfish and self-centered, neglectful of the fundamental laws of nature, forgetting the rights of their fellow man to the point their very existence is imperiled, force of circumstances always impels them to turn to the soil from whence they came to recover self-maintenance.

Fundamentally, all people are endowed with certain inalienable rights; such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, these rights constituting a proclamation of independence which has long been a prerequisite to the right of self-maintenance. Nevertheless, it has been jeopardized by man's profligacy.

To secure and enjoy self-maintenance humanity must recognize the fact that it is from the soil rather than from factory floors and merchants' shelves that comes the basic sustenance, for, when centralized industry becomes destructive of the human rights of the masses to live and enjoy life man must turn either to the loamy soil, the rocky mountains, or the fisheries of the seas for self-maintenance if he would endure.

Some of today apparently have forgotten this fundamental fact or else they have taken it for granted that the farmer is inherently plagued with distress and disaster. They insist there is already an unusable surplus of farm products. They declare domestic consumption has shrunk and foreign markets have withered. They point with ridiculous candor to the increased acreage put under the plow by foreign nations and advise that for their own economic advancement these countries have shifted their supply sources elsewhere than from America. All such conditions, it is pointed out, constitute an emergency situation in agriculture demanding drastic reductions.

Nevertheless, the timely unfolding of nature's laws and the revelations of modern science have placed in the hands of man new tools, new means and measures with which to transform the basic productions of the raw materials of the soil into usable commodities for furthering life and industry, the future of which reveals no bounds to the most sanguine contemplator.

The revelations of nature's god have been prolific in unfolding to man these new sources of diversified action, wealth, and satisfaction. Chemistry, the handmaiden of modern progress, has withdrawn the veil heretofore obscuring numerous unknown sources of power, blessing the sweat of the farmer's brow, returning to him his constitutional privilege of tilling his acres at will, withdrawing the mandate of wealth limitations, setting to work idle hands and vouchsafing a future life of greater contentment.

For numerous years past the farmer's gross income has been practically identical with the pay rolls of city factories. Except for taxes, interest, and insurance, the farmer's income is mostly spent for manufactured products. If men of the soil prosper, so do also men of the city. If the farmer has little to spend the city man has little to sell. Keeping the farmer's income on a normal basis is always fundamental to maintaining a required basis for city enterprises.

Past history proves that depressions invariably terminate and prosperity returns when markets for former basic industries are expanded and new industries are created. New crops, new and improved methods of producing them, new markets, an increasing population to patronize them, are all fundamental to general prosperity, for when the farmer prospers so do all other enterprises.

History reveals that emergency measures do not long endure; they never perform any miracles; but the steady plodding of basic laws already understood and the constant application of foresight, energy, skill, philosophy, and logical perseverance do win ultimate favorable results. Food, shelter, and raiment are prime requisites of humanity. Confidence in one another is essential. The desire not only to live but to also let live opens the highway for enjoyment of desired conveniences, luxuries, and greater abundance. It is in the persistent and orderly development of these fundamentals, with equality for all and favoritism for none, that the wholesome flavor of existence, the increased zeal of satisfaction, and the widening of commerce accrues. Persistent development in orderly fashion is the only remedy conducive to ultimate victory for the farmer and his kinsmen.

During the past few years our horizon has been circumscribed by near limitations. Our range of economic vision has been curtailed. We have failed to look beyond the confines of the immediate day. We have not rightly soliloquized on the rising sun of tomorrow. Indeed, economically speaking, we have burdened ourselves with the need of settling and satisfying immediate needs and conditions regardless of future consequences and costs. Perhaps the urgency of the present tense has demanded such action in part; but the forgetfulness of its coming consequence is not forgivable. The accepting and surrendering of temporary passing advantages of any one set of humans at the expense of the majority living in a given nation is reprehensible and unpardonable.

Ultimate and universal prosperity for the millions of citizens who reside on farms and who occupy the towns and villages adjacent thereto is primarily essential to the prosperous well-being of others who dwell within major corporate limits.

Expediency is never profitable for long. While it may for the present lift one up by his own bootstraps, yet eventually the gravitating law of supply and demand overcomes any present advantage. The present economic depression brought about largely by man's vainglorious foolishness, embodies a future aspect of

solution as important as that of the present. The perilous times of the present call for high accomplishment in behalf of the future years as well as the one now existing. There must be a profiting from past evils to make the future secure against repetition of them. There must be a realization of the true philosophy of life which insures a fine heritage of citizenship to the young and yet unborn citizens of this land which looks toward insuring them the same constitutional rights and privileges enjoyed by their forefathers. No man has any right to heap a burden upon his future kith and kin. No nation has a right to institute immediate means of economic relief, the brunt of which innocent future citizens must bear and discharge in handicapped manner for their own existence or perpetuation.

"Civilization begins and ends with the plow." The implement makers of America form her first line of defense against poverty and at the same time her battle line of progress against the ranks of pernicious penury. The farmer's occupation forms the mudsills upon which is built the superstructure of all other successful business enterprises, and, unless those groundwork timbers are solidly laid in the mortar of favorable legislation and cemented on a base of equitable recognition, no matter how beautiful the superstructure reared above it, no national house can ever endure for long.

While all citizens are but transient occupants of earth and tenants of the United States of America, yet they are here with the endowment of the inalienable rights vouchsafed by this Nation's Constitution, entitling them to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Acceptance of the farmers' declaration of independence by citizens in all vocations of life would be commendable and commensurate to guaranteeing such inherent rights to all citizens. Therefore, in firm reliance upon the approval and protection of divine Providence, in full realization of the proven fundamental philosophy of past human experience, and with all virtuous intentions, in the name of the Supreme Judge of mankind, may it so be done.

**REPEAL THE "RED RIDER"**

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and have them placed in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I am all for Mr. Sisson's bill to repeal the so-called "red rider." It is just another of those repressive measures that history teaches have never been successful.

Many of us feel that the menace to our Government does not come from the small group of Communists in the country, but from another minority group that is trying to abolish the civil rights and liberties guaranteed to us under our Constitution and Bill of Rights. These people are undoubtedly sincere in their patriotism, but have very little faith in our form of government and the power of our Constitution. They are taking it upon themselves to protect both by destroying the very foundation upon which these institutions were built.

Freedom of assembly has become almost a thing of the past. Freedom of speech was rescued from death recently by action of the Supreme Court. The imposition of the "red rider" and similar legislation shows that free speech is also imperiled.

Prior to coming to Washington, I was for many years president of one school board and member of another, and I have found our high-school boys and girls trustworthy, alert, and intelligent. Knowing the tragic blunders their elders have made of world affairs, they are justified in refusing to accept our dictum as to how things should be run in the future, which belongs, after all, not to us but to them.

In searching for a better way of life they must study the various existing forms of government, and in this study they need the guidance of wise and sympathetic men and women that they believe to be courageous and fair.

They need the best that can be had, and the imposition of reactionary and humiliating laws upon our teachers will banish from the profession the very type we need—men and women who understand that liberty is always dangerous but that, after all, it is the safest thing we have.

The gentleman from Texas has quoted from the Red Network some names of those classified by the author as being red, radical, or communistic.

He did not mention some others so classified in that amusing little volume; for instance, Jane Addams, Newton Baker, Rev. Parks Cadman, Senator and Mrs. Costigan, Albert



Einstein, Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Mrs. J. Borden Harri-man, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, Mayor La-Guardia, Dr. Mary Woolley, Dean Roscoe Pound, of Harvard, and many other equally dangerous and subversive citizens who are a menace to our Government, if the author of the Network is to be believed.

#### NO MORE OFFENSIVE WARS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago the United States Government declared war on the Imperial German Government. That war supposedly was to make the world safe for democracy and to be a war to end wars. It did not make the world safe for democracy. It did not end wars. It did not even protect the loans that had been made to allies by the American people. It did guarantee a lot of private loans. It did sell a lot of war materials. It did destroy billions of dollars of wealth. It did destroy millions of men. It likewise precipitated a depression. It also served to throw the American economic policy into utter confusion. We are still paying the price of that war.

I was 14 years old when that war was declared. I thought it was wrong then. I think it was wrong now, and I do not want to see it happen again.

On this nineteenth anniversary of our declaration of war nations are once more rushing preparations for another one. The United States Government is no laggard in this occupation. Again we are seeing the preparations that will create once more in the homes of thousands of American people the situation described by Robert W. Service in his poem, *Young Fellow, My Lad*.

"Where are you going, young fellow my lad,  
On this glittering morn of May?"

"I'm going to join the colors, dad;  
They're looking for men, they say."

"But you're only a boy, young fellow my lad;  
You aren't obliged to go."

"I'm seventeen and a quarter, dad,  
And ever so strong, you know."

"So you're off to France, young fellow my lad,  
And you're looking so fit and bright."

"I'm terribly sorry to leave you, dad,  
But I feel that I'm doing right."

"God bless you and keep you, young fellow my lad;  
You're all of my life, you know."

"Don't worry. I'll soon be back, dear dad,  
And I'm awfully proud to go."

"Why don't you write, young fellow my lad?  
I watch for the post each day;  
And I miss you so, and I'm awfully sad,  
And it's months since you went away.  
And I've had the fire in the parlor lit,  
And I'm keeping it burning bright  
Till my boy comes home; and here I sit  
Into the quiet night."

"What is the matter, young fellow my lad;  
No letter again today.  
Why did the post man look so sad,  
And sigh as he turned away?  
I hear them tell that we've gained new ground,  
But a terrible price we've paid:  
God grant, my boy, that you're safe and sound;  
But, oh, I'm afraid, afraid."

"They've told me the truth, young fellow my lad;  
You'll never come back again:  
(Oh God; the dreams and the dreams I've had,  
And the hopes I've nursed in vain!)  
For you passed in the night, young fellow my lad,  
And you proved in the cruel test  
Of the screaming shell and the battle hell  
That my boy was one of the best."

"So you'll live, you'll live, young fellow my lad,  
In the gleam of the evening star,  
In the wood-note wild and the laugh of the child,  
In all sweet things that are,  
And you'll never die, my wonderful boy,  
While life is noble and true;  
For all our beauty and hope and joy  
We will owe to our lads like you."

—Robert W. Service.

The last two lines—

For all our beauty and hope and joy, we will owe to our lads like you.

That will always be true in America when the young men are called to defend their country. Veterans of future wars, strikers for peace, organizations against offensive war would spring to the defense of their country if actually attacked. But never again do we want young men of America to become a part of the mud and blood of a foreign battlefield in guaranteeing somebody's filthy dollars. For defense, yes; for offense, no.

We are spending millions on defense. Let us not use those millions for offense. With these thoughts in mind, I have directed to every Member of Congress the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1936.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Much has been said in this session about the establishment of an effective neutrality program for the United States. However, the resulting legislation has measured up to this demand in only a very small way, but I think most of us will agree that steps in the right direction have been and are being taken. We are all agreed that an adequate defense policy must be established and permanently maintained. Ninety-two percent of the American people insist we use our vast armaments for defense and not for aggression against or assistance to another nation unless they, the American people, are able to so signify.

I believe that it was in this light that Representative LUDLOW proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that, except in the event of an invasion of the United States or its territorial possessions, the authority of Congress to declare war shall not become effective until confirmed by a majority vote of all votes cast thereon in a Nation-wide referendum.

I am emphatically endorsing the Ludlow resolution, and have signed a petition to bring this measure before the House.

However, it must be remembered such an amendment can only be made through the means prescribed in the Constitution, namely, ratification by the legislatures or conventions elected for the purpose of ratification in three-fourths of the several States. We have seen this procedure take months and even years in the case of other constitutional amendments. And there is always the possibility that such a resolution may never leave the committee.

Meanwhile another world war seems to draw nearer and nearer. Immediate measures are necessary to keep our country out of this war.

I am therefore proposing to the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate a pledge. This pledge will provide as follows: "As long as I am a Member of the Congress of the United States, I hereby pledge that I will never vote to declare war on any country unless that country invades the Territorial limits of the United States or the possessions thereof."

Enforcement of this pledge will in no way interfere with the good-neighbor policy of the United States and the maintenance of adequate naval and air forces to protect us from any possible invasion, the possibilities of which at the present time are remote.

What is more important, this pledge will mean that we who sign it will never vote for offensive and imperialistic warfare as long as we are in Congress, and Congress has the sole power to declare war. It is unnecessary to assume that the present Members of Congress are anything but opposed to war for offensive purposes. Time and again, when we have been appropriating vast sums for our Army, Navy, and air forces, we have said, "This money is not for offensive war; it is necessary for an adequate national defense."

If those Members of Congress who made the foregoing utterance were sincere, I believe they will not hesitate to sign this pledge. A representative from my office will present this pledge to you some time this week, and I sincerely trust that you will join with me in signifying to the American people our sincerity and our leadership for peace.

Sincerely yours,

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report (Rept. No. 2362), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

#### House Resolution 477

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 3483, an act to provide for rural electrification, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment and any other amendments recommended



by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

#### THE LATE STERLING P. STRONG

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, at his home in Dallas, Tex., one of the former Members of this House, the Honorable Sterling P. Strong, passed to his final reward.

Mr. Strong had the distinction of representing the entire State of Texas during his service here. One of the Dallas papers in a recent editorial paid to Mr. Strong their compliment:

Sterling P. Strong believed what he believed with all his might. Mr. Strong was wide and favorably known. His long list of personal friends is the best evidence of his worth.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, the privilege of placing in the permanent records of the House of Representatives this statement with reference to my former colleague, who is remembered with kindly sentiments by many Members of this body.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 381. An act granting insurance to Lydia C. Spry;
- H. R. 605. An act for the relief of Joseph Maier;
- H. R. 685. An act for the relief of the estate of Emil Hoyer (deceased);
- H. R. 762. An act for the relief of Stanislaus Lipowicz;
- H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Herman Schierhoff;
- H. R. 2469. An act for the relief of Michael P. Lucas;
- H. R. 3184. An act for the relief of H. D. Henion, Harry Wolfe, and R. W. McSorley;
- H. R. 3254. An act to exempt certain small firearms from the provisions of the National Firearms Act;
- H. R. 3369. An act for the relief of the State of Alabama;
- H. R. 3629. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional land for the use of Walter Reed General Hospital;
- H. R. 4086. An act for the relief of Ellis Duke, also known as Elias Duke;
- H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John T. Clark, of Seattle, Wash.;
- H. R. 5764. An act to compensate the Grand View Hospital and Dr. A. J. O'Brien;
- H. R. 6335. An act for the relief of Sam Cable;
- H. R. 6645. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes", approved May 25, 1926;
- H. R. 7024. An act to authorize the sale by the United States to the municipality of Hot Springs, N. Mex., of the north half of the southeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 6, township 14 south, range 4 west, New Mexico principal meridian, New Mexico;
- H. R. 7788. An act for the relief of Mrs. Earl H. Smith;
- H. R. 8030. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of Republican River, Smoky Hill River, and minor tributaries of Kansas River with a view to the control of their floods;
- H. R. 8032. An act for the relief of the Ward Funeral Home;
- H. R. 8038. An act for the relief of Edward C. Paxton;
- H. R. 8061. An act for the relief of David Duquaine, Jr.;
- H. R. 8110. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Gardiner;
- H. R. 8300. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of Suwanee River in the State of Florida from Florida-Georgia State line to the Gulf of Mexico;
- H. R. 8559. An act to convey certain land to the city of Enfield, Conn.;
- H. R. 8577. An act to amend the Teachers Salary Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 4, 1924, as amended, in relation to raising the trade or vocational schools to the level of junior high schools, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8797. An act to provide a preliminary examination of Onondago Creek, in Onondaga County, State of New York, with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 8901. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near Apostle Islands, Wis.;

H. R. 9200. An act authorizing the erection of a marker suitably marking the site of the engagement fought at Columbus, Ga., April 16, 1865;

H. R. 9671. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of material to the sea-scout service of the Boy Scouts of America;

H. R. 10182. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire the timber rights on the Gigling Military Reservation (now designated as Camp Ord) in California;

H. R. 10185. An act to amend the act approved June 18, 1934, authorizing the city of Port Arthur, Tex., or the commission thereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over Lake Sabine, at or near Port Arthur, Tex., and to extend the times for commencing and completing the said bridge;

H. R. 10187. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

H. R. 10262. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges across the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Youghiogheny Rivers in the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 10316. An act to legalize a bridge across Poquetanuck Cove at or near Ledyard, Conn.;

H. R. 10465. An act to legalize a bridge across Second Creek, Lauderdale County, Ala.;

H. R. 10490. An act to amend chapter 9 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory and supplementary thereto;

H. R. 10975. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of Marshy Hope Creek, a tributary of the Nanticoke River, at and within a few miles of Federalsburg, Caroline County, Md., with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 11045. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Rockport, Ind., and Owensboro, Ky.;

H. R. 11323. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the founding of the first settlement on Long Island, N. Y.;

H. R. 11365. An act relating to the filing of copies of income returns, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11425. An act for the relief of Gustava Hanna;

H. R. 11945. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Department of Public Works of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the construction, maintenance, and operation of certain free highway bridges to replace bridges destroyed by flood in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution accepting the invitation of the Government of France to the United States to participate in the International Exposition of Paris—Art and Technique in Modern Life, to be held at Paris, France, in 1937.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 3, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

758. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 31, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Kennebec River, Maine, with a view to dredging the river from Augusta to Gardiner, authorized by the River and



Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

759. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 31, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Pass Cavallo, Tex., and channel from Pass Cavallo to Port O'Connor and Port Lavaca, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

760. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 31, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Naubinway Harbor, Mackinac County, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 476. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 12037; without amendment (Rept. No. 2344). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 11850. A bill providing for a preliminary examination of New Creek, Staten Island, N. Y., with a view to control of its floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 11221. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination of the Blackstone, Seekonk, Moshassuk, and Woonasquaket Rivers and their tributaries in the State of Rhode Island, with a view to the control of their floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EICHER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10589. A bill to amend section 32 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes", approved August 30, 1935; with amendment (Rept. No. 2347). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MALONEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11103. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Gretna, La.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2348). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11729. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Natchez, Miss., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2349). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DARDEN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 12032. A bill to amend section 10 and to repeal section 16 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the distribution, promotion, retirement, and discharge of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes", approved May 29, 1934 (48 Stat. 811), and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PIERCE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11821. A bill to correct an error in section 16 (e) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, with respect to adjustments in taxes on stocks on hand, in the case of a reduction in processing tax; without amendment (Rept. No. 2351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAVERICK: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11300. A bill to provide that the sale of or dealing in beer, wine, or intoxicating liquor in Army post exchanges and military establishments shall be subject to regulation by the Secretary of War; without amendment (Rept. No. 2352). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STUBBS: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 11538. A bill for the relief of the Orland reclamation project, California; without amendment (Rept. No. 2353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KNUTE HILL: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 10001. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing certain tribes of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes", approved May 26, 1920; with amendment (Rept. No. 2354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DUFFY of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 149. A bill to amend section 64 of the bankruptcy law of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2355). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11616. A bill to fix the compensation of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11690. A bill relating to the admissibility in evidence of certain writings and records made in the regular course of business; without amendment (Rept. No. 2357). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MERRITT of New York: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12009. A bill to authorize the enlargement of Governors Island and consenting to the use of a portion thereof as a landing field for the city of New York and its environs; with amendment (Rept. No. 2358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARTER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11920. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Air Corps Reserve; with amendment (Rept. No. 2359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COSTELLO: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8050. A bill to authorize the acquisition of land for military purposes in San Bernardino and Kern Counties, Calif., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLEAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9042. A bill to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Supply Base to the city of Newark, N. J.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEMPSEY: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. S. 4232. An act to create a commission and to extend further relief to water users on United States reclamation projects and on Indian irrigation projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 2364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEMPSEY: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. S. 3488. An act to provide for an examination and survey to determine the best utilization of the surplus waters of the San Juan River and to determine the feasibility and cost of storing such waters and of diverting them to the Rio Chama; with amendment (Rept. No. 2365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11983) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Booher; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.



A bill (H. R. 11816) to correct the United States Coast Guard service of Jesse D. Gause; Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CITRON: A bill (H. R. 12131) to broaden the benefits provided for rural rehabilitation under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, and to extend similar benefits to the urban population, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 12132) to further amend the National Housing Act, to provide relief for merchants who suffered losses by floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 12133) to authorize a preliminary examination of the Congree, Santee, and Cooper Rivers and their tributaries in the State of South Carolina with a view to the control of their floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 12134) limiting officers of the Navy from serving more than 4 years out of any consecutive 8 years on duty in the Navy Department, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FIESINGER: A bill (H. R. 12135) providing for a preliminary examination of the Sandusky River, at Fremont, Ohio, with a view to control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. ENGEL: A bill (H. R. 12136) to amend sections 2 and 3 of title I of the social-security law approved August 14, 1935; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALLECK: A bill (H. R. 12137) for a survey and examination of the lake shore of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 12138) authorizing the Secretary of War to convey certain interests of the United States in and to a tract of land formerly a part of the military reservation of the Presidio of San Francisco and thereafter conveyed upon condition to the city and county of San Francisco for certain purposes, to the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District for highway purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 12139) providing for continuing retirement pay under certain conditions of officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who incurred physical disability while in the service of the United States during the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Resolution (H. Res. 478) requesting that the Postmaster General resign from his political post as chairman of the Democratic National Committee or from his Cabinet office; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAPES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 555) to create a Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Administrative Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ENGEL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 556) providing for a commission to study and make recommendations as to the various systems providing for old-age benefits with a view of recommending more adequate provisions for such old-age assistance and benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, regarding an amendment to the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNHAM: A bill (H. R. 12140) for the relief of Burlton Wake; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12141) for the relief of Truscon Steel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 12142) for the relief of Cyrus M. Lasher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIETRICH: A bill (H. R. 12143) granting a pension to Freeman Isaac Lott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 12144) for the relief of the Federal Enameling & Stamping Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 12145) for the relief of DePass & Maines and the Alachua County Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 12146) for the relief of Frank Monroe; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 12147) for the relief of the New York & Baltimore Transportation Line; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINZER: A bill (H. R. 12148) granting a pension to Mae Buckius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 12149) to amend and correct application for copyright filed by Effie Canning Carlton on February 10, 1915, with the register of copyrights and bearing renewal registration no. 6384, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 12150) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy, and officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps, to accept such medals, orders, diplomas, decorations, and photographs as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. O'DAY: A bill (H. R. 12151) for the relief of Rose Hausman Weidman (nee Reisla Hausman); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 12152) granting a pension to Dora Samples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12153) for the relief of Roberta Carr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12154) granting a pension to Louvisa Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 12155) granting a pension to Lela Lewellin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 12156) for the relief of Wayne Alvis Suddith and Leona Bernice Suddith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12157) for the relief of Rood Hospital, of Hibbing, Minn., Dr. H. E. Binet, of Grand Rapids, Minn., Sidney E. Mobley and Lucille E. Mobley, of Hale, Mo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10648. By Mr. COLDEN: Resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., on March 24, 1936, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the continuance and completion of flood-control construction under the direction of the Army engineers in Los Angeles County of the State of California; to the Committee on Flood Control.

10649. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the Lawrence (Mass.) Harugari Association, Inc., protesting against the proposed additional tax to be placed on malt beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10650. By Mr. DUFFY of New York: Resolution adopted by the Irondequoit Chapter, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Rochester, N. Y., endorsing the Reynolds-Starnes bill (H. R. 11172) and opposing enactment of



the Kerr-Coolidge bill (H. R. 8163), pertaining to aliens, and for the removal of difficulties of becoming American citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10651. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Westchester, State of New York, referring to the appropriation for the erection of new armories throughout the United States and especially for the city of Mount Vernon, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10652. By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Resolution of the Commercial Club of Tolstoy, S. Dak., restricting the importation of livestock or livestock products from any foreign country harboring foot-and-mouth disease or any other transmissible diseases of livestock which do not now exist in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10653. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition of the Lincoln School Parent-Teacher Association (125 members), endorsing the Federal food and drug bill by Mr. COPELAND (S. 5); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10654. Also, petition of the Lincoln School Parent-Teacher Association (125 members), endorsing the Pettengill bill (H. R. 6472) and requesting that it be brought before the House of Representatives for a hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10655. Also, petition of the Summit Junior High School Parent-Teacher Association (267 members), endorsing the Federal food and drug bill by Mr. COPELAND (S. 5); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10656. Also, petition of the Summit Junior High School Parent-Teacher Association (267 members), endorsing the Pettengill bill (H. R. 6472) and requesting that it be brought before the House of Representatives for a hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10657. Also, petition of the William McKinley School Parent-Teacher Association of Camden, N. J. (70 members), endorsing the Neely-Pettengill bill (S. 3012, H. R. 6472), and requesting that it be brought before the House; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10658. Also, petition of Local 377, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, unanimously favoring another appropriation by the President to continue Works Progress Administration projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10659. Also, petition of the State Council Welfare Committee (over 50,000 members), opposing the Kerr-Coolidge bill and endorsing the Reynolds-Starnes immigration restriction and alien deportation registration bill (H. R. 11172, S. 4011); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10660. By Mr. MURDOCK: Resolution of the Board of County Commissioners of Box Elder County, Utah, urging further appropriations for the Public Works Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10661. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the citizens of Detroit, Mich., endorsing House bill 8540; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10662. Also, petition of the International Workers Order, endorsing the Frazier-Lundeen social-insurance bill (H. R. 9680); to the Committee on Labor.

10663. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Detroit, Mich., endorsing the building of a bridge across the Straits of Mackinac; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10664. Also, petition of 71 members of the International Workers Order, Detroit, Mich., endorsing House bill 9680; to the Committee on Labor.

10665. Also, petition of residents of Detroit, endorsing House bill 8540, introduced by Congressman KENNEY, of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10666. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Hornell Chamber of Commerce, Hornell, N. Y.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

10667. Also, petition of the Utah Workers Alliance, Local No. 1; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 3, 1936

(Legislative day of Monday, Feb. 24, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 2, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Chavez	Keyes	Pittman
Ashurst	Clark	King	Pope
Austin	Connally	La Follette	Radcliffe
Bachman	Coolidge	Lewis	Reynolds
Bailey	Copeland	Logan	Robinson
Barbour	Couzens	Lonergan	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Davis	Long	Sheppard
Benson	Donahay	McGill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Duffy	McKellar	Smith
Black	Fletcher	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Frazier	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Brown	Glass	Moore	Truman
Bulkley	Guffey	Murphy	Tydings
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hastings	Neely	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Wagner
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Walsh
Caraway	Holt	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Carey	Johnson	Overton	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] are absent from the Senate because of illness; and that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], my colleague the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER], and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions numerous signed by members of the Women's Study Club, of Hoyt, and members of the Methodist Episcopal Churches of Hoyt and Mayetta, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the so-called Neely bill (S. 3012) to prohibit the compulsory block-booking and blind-selling of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a petition from the Ludell (Kans.) Equity Exchange, praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (H. R. 6772) to amend the Grain Futures Act to prevent and remove obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in grains and other commodities by regulating transactions therein on commodity futures exchanges, to limit or abolish short selling, to curb manipulation, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented letters in the nature of memorials from Star Valley Grange, No. 1661, of Iola; Shawnee Grange, No. 168, of Overland Park; Manhattan Grange, No. 743, of Manhattan; and Fairplain Grange, No. 1719, of Burlingame, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill